DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 420 CS 009 812

AUTHOR	Berger, Allen, Ed.
TITLE	Leaders for Literacy: Papers from the Conference (1st, Oxford, Ohio, June 20-23, 1988).
INSTITUTION	Miami Univ., Oxford, Ohio. School of Education.
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	178p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Heckert Reading and Writing Center, Department of Teacher Education, School of Education and Allied Professions, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Literacy; Poetry; *Reading Instruction; Reading Research; Textbook Selection; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	Teacher Researcher Cooperation; Teacher Researcher Relationship

ABSTRACT

The 10 papers collected in this book deal with reading and writing instruction, the relationship between teachers and researchers, the role of the school administration in promoting literacy, the dangers of inappropriate standards, using poetry to improve literacy, and textbook adoptions. Papers include: (1) "Knowing What to Do--And Doing It," (Margaret J. Early); (2) "From Practice to Research and Back Again," (Wayne Otto); (3) "A Principal's View," (Kay Walla); (4) "Getting Real--Forming Collaborative Alliances," (Jo Anne Vacca); (5) "Setting Realistic Standards," (Richard Vacca); (6) "The View from the Superintendent," (Mary Ann Corr); (7) "Poetry in the Reading Program: A Goal for Administrators," (Eileen Tway); (8) "Thinking about Adopting: Two Views," (Alan M. Frager and Maureen Vanterpool); (9) "Children's Language," (Andrew V. Johnston and Elizabeth B. Johnston); and (10) "Reading Terminology for the Up-to-Date Administrator," (Sarah L. Dowhower). (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED311450

CS009812

LEADERS FOR LITERACY

Papers from the First Conference

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
JUNE 20-23

1988

Early
Otto
Walla
Corr
Vacca & Vacca

Tway
Dowhower
Frager & Vanterpool
Johnston & Johnston

ALLEN BERGER
editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Allen Berger
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Leaders for Literacy

Papers from the First Conference

June 20-23, 1988

Allen Berger

Heckert Reading and Writing Center

Miami University

Leaders for Literacy

Papers from The First Conference

Miami University

Single copies of this publication are available for $10 payable to the Heckert Reading and Writing Center.

©1989

Allen Berger, Editor
Heckert Reading and Writing Center
Department of Teacher Education
School of Education and Allied Professions
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Contents

Pages

Introduction 5

Acknowledgments 7

Knowing What to Do--And Doing It 8

Margaret J. Early

From ~~Research~~ Practice to ~~Practice~~ Research--And Back Again 34

Wayne Otto

Panel Presentation 76

Kay Walla: A Principal's View 77
Jo Anne Vacca: Getting Real--Forming Collaborative Alliances 96
Richard Vacca: Setting Realistic Standards 106

The View from the Superintendent 111

Sister Mary Ann Corr

ST COPY AVAILABLE

Selected Papers from Heckert Center Faculty 125

Poetry in the Reading Program: A Goal for Administrators 126

Eileen Tway

Thinking About Adopting: Two Views 134

Alan M. Frager and
Maureen Vanterpool

Children's Language 142

Andrew V. Johnston and
Elizabeth B. Johnston

Reading Terminology for the Up-to-Date Administrator 149

Sarah L. Dowhower

Authors 174

Introduction

One of the values of being an editor is that you get to read some wonderful writing. We have to tell you that this is such a document.

Margaret Early records ten important things we know about teaching reading and writing and tells what teacher educators, teachers, and administrators can do to make further strides toward improvements in literacy.

Wayne Otto observes that teachers should inform researchers as much as researchers should inform teachers and he tells how to do it.

Kay Walla tells other principals in detail how to improve their reading and writing programs through serving as "resources" and through exciting uses of computers.

Jo Anne Vacca appeals to schools, colleges and universities to develop more respect for each other's efforts as a basis for working more cooperatively.

Rich Vacca castigates inappropriate standards, charging that the tail often wags the dog, setting everyone at risk in schools.

Sister Mary Ann Corr tells how a school superintendent can set in motion what is needed to improve literacy throughout a district.

Eileen Tway explains specific ways in which poetry can improve literacy.

Alan Frager and Maureen Vanterpool provide two views about school book adoptions.

Andrew and Elizabeth Johnston share part of their hands-on research in improving literacy in schools.

Sarah Dowhower's article, "Reading Terminology for the Up-to-Date Administrator," is the basis of a smaller article, "A Principal's Guide to Reading Terminology," in the January 1989 issue of Principal.

We enjoyed all these articles, and we hope that you will. Please feel free to reproduce any part of this publication including, of course, the appropriate acknowledgment on the reproductions.

Allen Berger

Miami University
September 1989

Acknowledgments

These papers were presented at the Leaders for Literacy Conference held during the summer of 1988 on the Miami University Campus. We deeply acknowledge the support of our colleagues in The Heckert Center for Reading and Writing; the Department of Teacher Education, Douglas M. Brooks, Chair; the School of Education and Allied Professions, Jan Kettlewell, Dean; Conferences and Continuing Education, James Pollicita, Director; and Miami University, Paul Pearson, President.

We also appreciate the typing by Donna Wilsman and Kim Miley, secretaries, and the proof reading by Sharon Evans, secretary, Christen Fehr, Rosa Hunter, Amy Kachur, and Gwinn Gibbs, graduate assistants, Miami University.

The Leaders for Literacy Conference was cosponsored by the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Samuel G. Sava, Executive Director.

KNOWING WHAT TO DO -- AND DOING IT

Margaret Early
University of Florida

The great debates about how to teach reading are behind us. To be sure, we can still provoke arguments over related issues like testing and evaluation, the instructional materials (shall we throw out the basals? can computers teach reading?), who should teach reading beyond primary grades, and when to make the transition from learning to read in the first language to learning to read English. But there is more agreement than disagreement on the goals and content of reading instruction. Thanks to the research of cognitive psychologists, psycholinguists, and reading specialists over the last fifteen years, we have a sound knowledge base for teaching reading. We know what to teach and how and why. Now the emphasis has shifted to *where* and *why*, that is, to the structure of the educational system, to the classrooms, schools, and communities in which reading is being learned and taught.

In the 70s the question changed from "what is the best way to teach beginning reading?" (with its attendant concerns about the alphabet and phonics) to "how can we teach comprehension?" (Pearson, 1984). When the focus was still on beginning reading, the dominant question with regard to comprehension was "Can it be taught?" Comprehension, or more precisely the products of comprehension, could be tested; and the teaching of comprehension was commonly limited to asking questions and, in Durkin's view (1978-79), to "mentioning" skills. But by the 80s a substantial body of research had shown that the process of comprehension could be taught, that is, demonstrated, explained, discussed, and understood by learners.

Pearson notes in the same article another question of the 60s and 70s that had all but disappeared by the 80s: how can a school build a sound individualized reading program? That question diminished, he says, because two kinds of consensus were reached: first, that "progress in reading should be monitored frequently, minutely . . . and individually" and, second, that individualized instruction meant giving children skills exercises to be completed individually. These interpretations of individualizing, Pearson believes, and I agree, are widespread but are nevertheless sources of "serious discontent" among professionals in reading. The discontent results from what research has shown about the process of comprehension: that it can be taught and that we should be measuring process, not product, which is what those tests of minute, specific skills, to which Pearson refers, really measure.

In the five years since Pearson's article, we have moved beyond the "new" question he raised then. We have by now developed consensus about how to teach comprehension and about how readers develop their processes of comprehension. Let me here briefly enumerate some points of consensus before moving on to what I consider the big questions remaining, the questions of context, which I've called the *where* and *when* questions; to parallel *how, what,* and *why*. It should be noted that *to whom* and *by whom* are also questions of context, referring as they do to students and teachers.

What We Know

1. We should not isolate reading from the rest of the curriculum. We know that reading is a way of learning, a process to be acquired, not a subject to be learned. We know that reading is a means not an end. We know that it is useless for children to learn how to read unless they learn at the same time to choose to read. We are agreed that children should have practice in choosing what they read, or much of what they read.

2. Since reading is a way of learning, it must be taught, not merely practiced, in

all those school subjects that require the assimilation of ideas and information.

3. Since reading is a whole process, not just a collection of subskills, we teach an understanding of process and emphasize approaching a text in accordance with one's purpose for reading it. One of the best ways to teach an "approach" or a "strategy" is to model it.

4. Comprehension is the reconstruction of meaning, a process that is guided by the text and the reader's experience or prior knowledge. Therefore, activating prior knowledge is an important teaching step preceding an assigned reading. It is also a habit students must apply to their independent study of texts. (It is one of the purposes of the survey step in SQ3R.)

5. Textbooks in the content fields are the most common type of reading material we require of students in school. So long as they remain the major source of students' learning--whether or not they should be, whether or not textbook authors are indeed "inconsiderate" of their readers --we have an obligation to use content

textbooks as basic materials for teaching how to read and learn. Over the past twenty years we have moved in this direction with basal readers including textbook study sections and balancing literary selections with informational articles related to science, history, math, and other subjects. Good teachers, whether reading specialists or content teachers, frequently use content textbooks as they demonstrate reading strategies. But daily systematic teaching of reading in using content texts has yet to become the norm in elementary and secondary schools.

6. From research and years of experience we know that the more children read the better readers they become. Numerous studies, including those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, have shown the more children read in school the higher their achievement scores on standardized tests.

7. Instead of trying to develop comprehension skills by questioning students after they read a text, we help them to examine *how* they comprehend. To

do this, we set up situations in which they consciously question, predict, call up prior knowledge, and relate new learning to what is already known, using techniques like Rafael's Question Answer Relationships (QAR), Manzo's ReQuest, and reciprocal teaching. And we teach students to monitor not only miscues but misunderstanding of what the text says.

8. We recognize writing as a way of learning and use it to strengthen recall and to sort out meanings. In practice this means replacing workbooks and short answer quizzes with opportunities to write extended discourse.

9. We know that vocabulary is a powerful factor in comprehension, that teaching word meanings in isolation is ineffective, that students should learn how their vocabularies expand, that devices like semantic mapping refine and reinforce concepts and the words that label them.

10. We know that comprehension is related to readers' expectations, including what they have come to expect of various

forms of discourse. That is why we refresh their concept of story (e.g., using story grammars) and teach the analysis of other kinds of text.

This sampling of what we know about reading instruction may be sufficient introduction to what is the major problem confronting us. These ten ideas are by no means radical, or even new, though some of them are couched in new vocabulary. They have been common practice in a few good schools and in scattered classrooms in other schools for many years. But their implementation is so infrequent that observational studies like Goodlad's (1984) at the elementary level and Boyer's (1983) at the secondary level have failed to record very many instances.

Why Knowledge Is Not Applied

This decade has reverberated with accusations about the mediocrity of teaching, and blame has been hurled in several directions including over-regulation of the schools from the outside by parents and school boards, by state legislatures and governors' commissions, by federal policymakers and secretaries of education. The demand for better teaching has developed into more testing, less pedagogic freedom, according to one observer. "We have entered the greatest era of educational regulation in history," says the president of the American Federation of Teachers (Shanker, 1986).

A vivid image of the increasing regularization of schools over the decades is suggested by Gerald Grant's (1988) fruitful metaphor. Whereas the schools of the early twentieth century could be compared to an avocado, with a firm center of control surrounded by a homogeneous student body and encased in a very thin skin of outside regulation, the schools at mid-century are more aptly symbolized by the cantaloupe with its central mesh of seeds and fibers representing school authority and its thick rind suggesting the external bureaucracy. Today's schools, says Grant, are in the image of a watermelon: no core of authority, the seeds (i.e., school personnel) scattered throughout, the rind formidable in its thickness.

Teachers don't teach reading as well as they know how because they are not allowed to. They are over-regulated. So the counterattack is to empower teachers, returning pedagogic freedom to them through school-based management. Will the ten pieces of knowledge about reading instruction I enumerated earlier be better implemented in the schools of Rochester, New York; Hammond, Indiana; Dade County, Florida; the Carnegie Schools Program in Massachusetts; the Century Twenty-One schools in Washington State? (Pipho, 1988) Surely, there is reason to be optimistic, to support these experiments, and to evaluate the effects on reading instruction, which is so very basic to "the learning needs of all students." The goals statement of the Carnegie Schools Program declares that "significant change in meeting the learning needs of students takes place at the classroom level, and the school organization supports this change" (quoted by Pipho, 1988). Or, to give the same idea narrower focus: how we teach reading depends as much on where we teach as what we know.

Blame for not implementing the knowledge base provided by reading research is directed also at teacher education. Inevitably, the school reform movement triggered by *A Nation at Risk* led to an examination of how teachers are prepared. *The Holmes Report* called for preparing teachers like other professionals in a fifth year following the baccalaureate in the liberal arts and sciences. The profession should comprise a hierarchy of novices, lead teachers, and specialists. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in its report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers in the Twenty-First Century*, addressed the need for a professional environment where teachers could grow in their ability to serve children and where teachers would make the significant decisions about how best to satisfy local and state demands for accountability.

These reports are among many signs of the spreading awareness that context--where we teach--affects how we teach and that knowing how is necessary but insufficient. The context narrows to a specific school setting, and that setting is shaped by the people who inhabit it and the culture and institutions and events that shape them. The settings are so various even within the same school district that generalizations about how to teach reading lose their intended impact. Nevertheless, various though settings may be, they share some common characteristics; so generalizations can be adapted to special circumstances. Let's look then at three agents--teacher educators, teachers, and administrators--and ask how they can improve the contexts of reading instruction.

Teacher Educators

The dilemma in preservice education is whether to prepare future teachers for schools as they are or as they ought to be. We should be examining current practices and considering what needs to be changed and how transitions can be made gradually and effectively. As it is, we emphasize research and theory in an effort to develop in fledgling teachers a knowledge of how and why that diminishes rapidly in their first encounters in real classrooms.

Researchers at Michigan State followed elementary education students through two years of preservice courses and field experiences in two different programs. One program emphasized that good teaching means "paying attention to students' thinking and emphasizing conceptual change." The other focused on the teacher as decision-maker and carried the message that following a teacher's guide is "technical" teaching, not creative. Both programs urged that textbooks be used only as a resource; following a textbook, they implied, was mindless teaching. But students in both programs once they were in the classroom relied heavily on basals. Most of the time they followed the guides quite mechanically, without really understanding what they were doing (Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann).

It is safe to say that basal reading programs, particularly the teachers' manuals, are still today the *primary* instrument in training elementary reading teachers. Most teachers internalize a pedagogy of reading through following the scripted lessons in the manuals. Daily use of these manuals provides consistent practice that is far more effective in determining teaching practices than the methods course can be. If basal series were a perfect learning tool for all the different children and teachers who use them, we could be grateful for their impact on the training of teachers. But of course they are not perfect instruments. They must be used cautiously, critically, and creatively. Teacher education programs have a responsibility for developing competent users of basals. This cannot be done by ignoring basals or condemning them. It is as if we banned driver education, assuring the next generation that automobiles would be obsolete, telling them a bit about aerodynamics, showing them a couple of late model airplanes, and then giving them the keys to rental cars to drive from LaGuardia to Times Square.

In methods courses we should instead examine how and if basals are using the research of the last ten or fifteen years. We should demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of basal series and stimulate prospective teachers to ask (and answer) such questions as: Why does the manual suggest this practice? Does it, for example, enhance students' understanding of how to draw inferences, or does it merely test their ability to make a particular inference? Is the scripted lesson explicit enough for low achievers? How should explanations be modified? What should be omitted--or added--for children who are at a particular level of language development? How can the new teacher successfully fuse ideas such as collaborative learning or writing process approaches with the basal program that the school has adopted? How can beginning teachers collaborate with experienced teachers to loosen the grip of the basal, to include whole language approaches, to assure that study skills are taught in content areas?

Because basal series are powerful instruments of teacher education, reading professionals in the schools and in the universities must assume responsibility for improving them.. On the one hand this means helping teachers to know what to ask for and on the other making sure that when publishers deliver schools will respond. Given the pressures of a normal teaching environment, teachers' dependence on instructional materials is understandable. It is unreasonable to expect them to revise textbooks and manuals as they teach. The most we can expect of teachers is that they use materials selectively and critically. But real reforms in teaching reading will come only when publishers produce materials that assist in whole language approaches, in teaching strategies instead of skills, and in developing understanding of process instead of automated responses.

In colleges of education we can neither show nor tell future teachers all they need to know, but we can instill habits of thinking critically and constructively about the different environments, school populations, and instructional approaches they will find in the schools that hire them and that will influence their continuing development positively or negatively.

Teachers

The fact that teachers are shaped by the schools that hire them means that school personnel are also teacher educators. Let me make recommendations for teachers' on-the-job training in two areas: basal reading instruction and reading in the content fields.

With respect to the first, I urge teacher collaboratives focused on the mainline reading program in elementary schools. From a few schools across the nation, we've learned the importance of support groups for teachers who are learning to emphasize process approaches in writing. We've learned that groups of teachers reading children's books and coming together to talk about them give powerful impetus to their schools' featuring of children's literature. We need the same kind of collaborative learning centered on basals.

It isn't enough to install a new reading system, call in the company's consultant a few times, and then let the program take off. Instead, a basal study group should raise the same kinds of questions I've suggested should be included in preservice courses. Think of how much the beginning teacher could learn from discussing specific selections, practices, and materials with experienced colleagues. Think how much a beginner with a good background in reading research and teaching effectiveness studies could add to such discussions.

A basal study group could operate concurrently with a writing group and a literature group, but there will come a time when the three groups should merge to consider how to integrate reading, writing, and literature and thus reduce the dominance of the basal in a given school. At this point teachers should be ready to transfer strategies used in reading groups to the content areas.

While I recognize the values of linking reading instruction to literature, my major concern is to emphasize study skills in the content areas. Many schools today departmentalize from grade 4 or 5 on; so there are many teachers of content who don't think of themselves as reading teachers. In schools that are making progress toward "reading across the curriculum," I find reading resource specialists demonstrating in content classes, working with content teachers in daily work sessions during school time, supplying content teachers with folders of materials on each strategy being featured, and promoting "witnessing" on the part of content teachers. It is the true believers who testify to the success of a strategy in their content classes who most effectively persuade other content teachers to try it. At the same time, witnessing strengthens the believer's confidence and competence. The successful reading consultant arranges many opportunities for content teachers to demonstrate and witness within their own schools, in schools across the country, and at regional and national conferences.

Leaders and Administrators

When I asked a group of seventh grade reading teachers I'm presently working with to tell me what change in their schools would most improve reading instruction, the most frequent answers involved the principal's role. They wanted leadership and moral support in working with content teachers. They wanted improved scheduling and space allocation. Chiefly, they wanted principals to understand why reading classes alone cannot improve students' learning of content. These 25 reading teachers from as many middle schools in a single school district are, most of them, willing to work with content teachers, but they are tucked away in reading laboratories, serving large numbers of students who are funneled into the labs from social studies classes. They are generally ignored by the teachers not assigned to the labs with their classes and resented by the teachers who are since they consider nine weeks in reading lab as time lost from learning social studies. This outmoded system can be changed only with administrative support. It isn't enough for the superintendent to say the right things, nor for the district reading coordinator to issue edicts and arrange inservice sessions. Every one of those 25 schools presents a unique set of problems. General solutions won't apply. It is the building principal who holds the key. Of course, all 25 principals differ in their beliefs about reading, their administrative styles, their hiring practices, their resources and personal energies. Yet here are several steps they could take.

They could join teachers in study groups such as those suggested in the preceding section. They could set up a steering committee to evaluate the situation in their schools. They could involve students and parents in studying how to improve learning opportunities. Depending on the reading lab director's strengths, they could enable her (or him) to make the transition from teaching children only in pull-out situations to working with teachers and students in content classes. They could help to determine the reasonable apportionment of resources between remedial and content area reading in their school (since this balance will differ among schools in this district). They could make possible the schoolwide SSR (Sustained Silent Reading) that almost all these reading teachers recommend.

Administrators can maintain their support of reading instruction even as they deal with larger administrative issues such as school-based management, restructuring the curriculum, using community resources, and achieving more flexible scheduling with the help of advanced computer technology. Most important, they can interpret current teacher evaluation systems and work with their teachers on the one hand and state education officials on the other to make such systems more effective instruments for professional development.

Perhaps the most fundamental role for principals is to promote reading in their schools and communities by identifying and rewarding excellent teaching of reading. To do this, they must learn to recognize excellence not merely by standardized test scores but by library circulation figures, quality of student writing, students' and teachers' attitudes toward textbooks, the academic climate of the school, and the strategies content teachers provide their students for learning through reading.

These recommendations for teacher educators, teachers, and administrators require steadfast effort, I realize, but they are possible even within our present inadequate school structures. To the extent that these steps and others like them improve the context of reading instruction we can shrink the gap that now exists between knowing how to teach reading and getting it done.

References

Boyer, E.L. *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, Harper and Row, New York, 1983.

Durkin, Dolores. What classroom observations reveal about reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 14, 481-533.

Feiman-Nemser, S. and Buchmann, M. When is student teaching teacher education? (Research Series No. 178) Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, East Lansing, MI, 1986.

Goodlad, John. *A Place Called School*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1984.

Grant, Gerald. *The World We Created at Hamilton High*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1988. pp. 124-125.

Pearson, David. "Four Essential Changes in Comprehension Instruction," in *Quest for Quality: Improving Basic Skills Instruction in the 1980's.* Parkoy, O'Bryan, Hennessey, eds., University Press of America, Lanham, MD, 1984. pp. 51-61.

Pipho, Chris. "Restructured School: Rhetoric on the Rebound?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, June, 1988. p. 710-711.

Shanker, Albert. Quoted by Walter Karp in editorial in *Harper's* February, 1986.

FROM ~~RESEARCH~~ PRACTICE TO ~~PRACTICE~~ RESEARCH AND BACK AGAIN

WAYNE OTTO
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Some people are inclined to sprinkle their speech and writing with the lines and aphorisms of prominent folks because they fancy that it lends an air of erudition to their stuff. Such practice has no research support that I know of--in fact the effect might often be just the opposite--but there's a certain folksy appeal there and so I do it when my fancy's struck and the mood seems right.

Like now.

I feel bad, though, that it's a Richard Nixon line I fancy using here. I'd like to say right up front at the outset that I want to make one thing perfectly clear: the person who typed this is not to blame for the sloppy appearance of the title.

I am. As one of our better presidents put it, the buck stops here.

So the story so far is that the title change is deliberate, not sloppy. And now, in the words of the immortal Paul Harvey, here is the rest of the story.

When I first took a quick look at the program for this conference, I saw that the title of my talk was "Research to Practice and Back Again." I liked the back again part of it because I've always thought that what we really need in reading education is more two-way communication between researchers and practitioners; and "back again" implies dialogue, so that made me feel good. But I was disappointed, too, because the research to practice part of it seemed to imply the same old thing: that research informs practice or, worse, that practitioners ought to rely on researchers themselves or on professional extractors--guys like me--for extracting practice from research. I don't think that's the way things really ought to be.

This is what I tell my students: Show me somebody who thumps a stack of research reports and tells teachers that "the REsearch says..."and I'll show you somebody who, more likely than not, is about to make claims that come close to or even go far beyond what could be called false advertising. In some ways it's like the TV evangelist who thumps the good book and shouts "The Bible says..." whatever it is that he's decided will best serve his personal needs. There's an assumption of blind faith on the part of the listeners; and there's a denial of any other interpretations or needs. Furthermore, putting the TV evangelist analogy aside, the REsearch thumper is almost certain to ignore the disclaimers and qualifying statements of competent research reports.

Show me, instead, somebody who says, while quietly handing out a list of references on the topic, "The research seems to suggest..." or words to that effect. I've noticed that people who know research are likely to prefer reSEARCH; whereas, those who are inclined to exploit it say REsearch. I know you can think of some exceptions. (So can I; but still...) To my mind, credibility is greatly enhanced when there is no dogmatic statement of what the research says. And, more important, I think that reality is more sensibly addressed when there is no implicit assumption that research comes before practice in the scheme of things.

So--assuming you've been able to follow the thin line of my story so far--you can see why I was pleased when I went back later for a closer look at the program for this conference and saw that the actual title given for my talk is "From Practice to Research and Back Again." I like that. I think it reflects a nicer view of reality as it's experienced by school people and a more promising order of things if research is, indeed, to inform and improve practice.

What appears, then, to be a case of sloppy title-typing is in fact a way to emphasize what I think is a better way to view the practice/research relationship.

I tell you all this because I think that the transposition of a couple of words in the title of my talk underscores one of the dilemmas that continues to trouble teachers and, particularly, teacher educators when they contemplate a research/practice relationship. Speaking only for myself, these are some of the questions I've been contemplating for a long time.

- Should research drive instruction?
- Would research results ever be comprehensive and definitive enough for that?
- Or should instruction drive research, with attention given to perceived flaws in and limitations of instructional practice?
- Would the scope of such research be sufficient, then, to yield new insights and point new directions?

For this presentation, though, I tried not to get bogged down in such relatively abstract issues but to think instead about the role of research in teachers' day-today efforts to provide their pupils with effective reading instruction.

But soon there were new questions to bog me down. Should teachers rely on conferences like this one and on the writers of textbooks and "research says" handbooks to tell them what the research says? Or should teachers be trained to extract what they need to know directly from research reports? What *do* teachers need to know about research? Would it be useful to train teachers to do action research of their own in order to resolve problems and to choose among alternative practices and materials? How could teachers best focus such action research efforts? What's the best fit between existing research and action research? How might busy teachers pick and choose from the journals, books and library shelves filled with research-related to reading? As I contemplated these new questions my fancies turned to images of flailing teachers sinking in a quagmire of research reports and passive pupils waiting to be taught.

And then among those fancied images I saw a familiar face that reminded me of lines that I know and love. It was Jimmy Stewart playing Elwood P. Dowd in the fanciful classic, *Harvey*. Remember the part where Elwood's sisters are trying to get him committed to an asylum? Elwood's niece takes up with one of the asylum attendants and her life takes a turn from simple to complex. That's when her mother, Elwood's sister, says to her, "Young lady, you have a lot to learn, and I hope you never learn it." And that's when I knew what I want most to say to teachers about the research related to reading instruction.

> *Teachers, you have a lot to learn...*
>
> The proliferation of research related to reading presents any number of dilemmas to teachers. One might read broadly and deeply from original reports, attempting to draw valid inferences and strike reasonable balances; one might read much more selectively, seeking ways to approach

> and resolve local issues; one might ignore original sources and rely on reviewers, translators of research for suggestions and direction; or one might simply throw up one's hands in despair. The problem is that there already is more reading research than a busy practitioner can sort out in a lifetime, and much more is generated each month.
> *...and I hope you never learn it.*

Like Elwood's sister, I'm genuinely concerned, and I'd like to be helpful. Unfortunately, though, I'm not at all sure what to offer by way of advice. I'm quite convinced, however, that learning all that *might* be relevant could be painful and, in the long run, not very rewarding.

Teachers have reason, it seems to me, to ask some fundamental questions about the role of research in reading instruction. For example: How does--and how *should*--research figure in the process of making instructional decisions? Should teachers be *producers* as well as *consumers* of research? As a consumer, how can a teacher approach the vast literature of reading research with much hope of finding information that will be useful in improving instruction? These are tough questions that deserve answers; but the best answers are ones that fit unique situations and suit specific needs. What I'd like to consider with you then, is not specific answers to questions such as these, but ways to seek answers that are personally relevant and useful.

Making Instructional Decisions

There are four main bases for making educational decisions (Borg, 1983): personal experience, expert opinion, the research literature, and action research. Each has its pros and cons; together they provide solid cornerstones for the planning and improvement of reading instruction.

Personal Experience

Like most everybody else, teachers are inclined to make most of their decisions on the basis of their personal experience. One reason is that all of us tend to be very

44

comfortable with what's familiar. Witness the common observation of teacher educators that teachers in the field are more likely to teach as they were taught than as they were taught to teach. Another reason is that personal success experiences have more credibility than the success stories of others. Not only that, but when instant decisions must be made every day, personal experience is the most readily accessible basis for action. Alternatives may be too time consuming to pursue. Jo Fraatz (1987) presents a compelling view of such realities in schools and classrooms in her book, *The Politics of Reading.*

Yet there are serious entries on the debit side of the ledger. First, personal experiences are accumulated in a haphazard fashion, so it's chancy to assume that what worked with a unique group of students in a unique situation will work with other students in other places. Second, memories of past experience may be faulty. The human inclination is to recall successes and other experiences that bolster biases and to repress failures and experiences that contradict cherished beliefs and practices. Finally, decisions that are based strictly on personal experience ignore the accumulated knowledge and experience of others.

On the one hand, then, personal experience is a powerful and pervasive basis for decision making; but on the other hand, it is necessarily limited in both scope and vision. Borg (1983, p. 5) cautions: "A basic rule in decision-making is that the more relevant information the decision-maker has, the more likely it is that she will make a sound decision."

Expert Opinion

Expert opinion is based not only on the expert's personal experience but also on the shared experiences, judgments and research findings of others. When opinion is restrained by balance and common sense, this broader view can contribute substantially to the decision-making process. In the schools, reading specialists are generally seen as the main purveyors of expert opinion regarding reading instruction. If the reading specialists are well-experienced and informed, this is as it should be. There is no escaping the fact, however, that experts' interpretations are nearly certain to be influenced by their own experiences--and perhaps prescribed by selective viewing of evidence that supports preconceived notions.

The reading specialist who best fills the role of expert is the one who functions as a broker between a larger cohort of experts (practitioners, researchers and scholars) and local teachers. That function is well served so long as the specialist remains objective in weighing and interpreting evidence and unbiased in offering recommendations.

The Research Literature

Practitioners--including both reading specialists and teachers--with the skills they need to read and evaluate research reports have access to a resource that goes far beyond personal experience and expert opinion. Teachers who go directly to the literature have the advantage of knowing their own situation better than any outside expert and assurance that their search can be as comprehensive as they care to make it. Omissions and distortions can be minimized, information can be as timely as this month's journals, and the search can be focused precisely on problems as they are perceived in the classroom.

The disadvantage of a personal literature search is that it requires hard, time-consuming work. This is one of the main reasons that, more often than not, the search is delegated to the reading specialist. Delegated or not, a diligent literature search is an important step toward informed decision making.

Action Research

If a literature search fails to yield information that is on target for solving a given problem, an *action research project* may be in order. The main features of *action research* are its relative informality and its focus on day-to-day school problems as they are actually being experienced. More formal educational research is designed to test theory and to advance scientific knowledge. In order to obtain results that can be applied beyond a particular sample, the researcher carefully designs her study to meet rigorous standards of external validity. *Action research* employs the scientific method, but because the practitioner is not interested in generalizing beyond the local situation, many of the rigorous criteria of regular research can be relaxed. Selecting a sample of students, for example, would be easier in a given action research project because the practitioner would be interested in generalizing only to the tenth grade students in his own school or district. Furthermore, since the practitioner is mainly interested in practical significance, there is no need for inferential statistics; if statistical tests are used at all, nonparametric techniques usually are sufficient.

Action research is in order when local practitioners are looking for a specific answer to a local question rather than results that can be generalized to other locales. By bringing the scientific method to bear in action research, practitioners can avoid the limitations of personal experience and expert opinion and, at the same time, put the realities of home in sharp focus.

Above all, action research is an *active* alternative in attempting to extract applications that don't quite fit from the research of others.

An Example

Here's an example of instructional decision making that makes use of all four of the bases I just discussed.

Imagine a scenario where teachers have read and discussed Jeanne Chall's (1983) *Stages of Reading Development.* They agree that movement from Chall's Stage One, *Decoding, Gluing to Print,* to Stage Two, *Fluency, Ungluing from Print,* is important to positive reading development.[1] Their decision is to seek ways to assure a smooth transition from Stage One to Stage Two in order to make provision for appropriate instruction in their program planning. The reading specialist agrees to do a literature search.

The search yields both evidence to support the importance of a smooth transition from decoding to fluency and suggestions for easing the transition. From the alternatives available, the planning group chooses the technique of repeated reading as the one most promising for developing fluency (Otto, 1985). Two members of the group volunteer to develop and share with other teachers directions for implementing the technique. In the course of their work, they come upon a study by Rashotte and Torgesen (1985) that makes them wonder about an important aspect of implementation. While most writers on the subject suggest repeated reading of the same material, Rashotte and Torgesen's results suggest *shared words* among practice passages may be more important than mere repetition of the very same practice passages. The subcommittee plans an action research study to help them get a better grasp of the issue and to guide their recommendations.

---

[1] Chall argues that the beginning reader's main task (Stage One) is, first, to learn to associate letter forms with letter sounds. She says, "To advance, to build up skill for making choices, beginners have to let go of pseudo-reading. They have to engage, at least temporarily, in what appears to be less mature reading behavior--becoming glued to print--in order to achieve real maturity later" (p. 18). And then, at Stage Two, the main task is to get unglued from print, to develop the fluency that is needed in order to shift attention from getting the words to getting the meaning.

Research-Based Decision-Making

To sum up, then, sensible instructional planning and improvement calls for well informed decision making. We have examined four main sources of information, starting with personal experience. The siren song of *personal experience* tends to be very seductive because everyone likes to believe that what worked once will work again--besides it's comfortable. Then, when the need for a broader base of information is recognized, one can reach out for the experience of others by seeking *expert opinion*. While such a move can be productive if the expert's role is clear and understood by all concerned, experts are as likely as anyone else to be selective viewers of reality and, therefore, purveyors of their own limits and biases. Experts are often inclined to say what the REsearch says ... to them, for their own purposes.

Well directed *searches of the literature* by people who are in touch with local realities--that is, say, members of a local program-planning group--can establish a broader base for making decisions and, at the same time, remain sensitive to local constraints and possibilities. The words "well directed" are the ones that call for perspective in approaching the reading research literature. A comprehensive search is certain not only to take more time than most teachers have available but also to yield a blooming, buzzing profusion of facts, implications and conclusions that have little relevance to specific planning needs and realities. Selective searches--ones that zero in on important issues identified by local practitioners--should produce much more useful results. And, in recognition of the time constraints on teachers, such searches may be delegated to a local specialist. Then, if equally attractive alternatives are identified, or unresolved questions are raised, action research can help to determine *what's best for us*.

Breaking into the Research Literature

Teachers who decide to limit themselves to selective searches that address issues of specific concern still need to break into a literature that is vast and varied in its scope. One can begin to get the task under control by identifying more manageable themes within the research literature and then pursuing the appropriate themes with specific research questions. I'm about to identify and discuss some possible themes, but understand that my purpose is not so much to describe specific pathways as to point general directions for breaking into the research. And then we need to consider, too, what "the research literature" does and does not offer to teachers who are interested in instructional improvements.

Two Research Thrusts

In an article in the *Handbook of Reading Research,* Kamil (1984) first acknowledges the broad and varied scope of reading related research: "Contemporary reading research is a rich mixture of influences from cognitive and physiological psychology, linguistics, anthropology, computer sciences, social psychology, learning theory, and educational practice. The influences range from the most abstract, theoretical points of view to the most practical, applied situations" (p. 39). Then he identifies two definable thrusts in recent research efforts.

The first is directed toward a clearer understanding of basic reading processes; it involves the generation and refinement of models and theories of the reading process as well as basic research. Kamil cites the following to demonstrate the point: Singer and Ruddell (1970, 1976) and Davis (1971) for their summaries of earlier work in modeling and theory construction; Carver (1977-1978), Gough (1972), Gough and Cosky (1975), Gough, Alford, Jr., and Holly-Wilcox (1979), Herndon (1978), Rumelhart (1977), Stanovich (1980) and Singer and Ruddell (1976) for evidence of current interest in theories and models; and LaBerge and Samuels (1983) for their continuing efforts to extend and refine the modeling of the reading process.

The second thrust is a continuation--but with renewed vigor and intensity--of the traditional quest for better methods of teaching reading in order to improve education and reduce illiteracy. The renewal can be attributed, at least in part, to (1) greater emphasis on the reader as an active seeker of information, (2) the availability and application of improved techniques for discourse analysis in reading research, and (3) increased interdisciplinary cooperation in translating research into practice. Work that emanates from the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University and from the Center for the Study of Reading at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana exemplifies the systematic nature of current attempts to identify and improve instructional practices in reading.

Teachers will have reason to direct attention to basic process research or the instruction-oriented research at different times and for different reasons. By and large, though, they need to recognize that (1) attention to process-oriented research may contribute to their understanding of the reading process, but it will not yield very much by way of specific instructional techniques and procedures, and (2) attention to instruction-oriented research will yield ideas about techniques and procedures that may or may not fit into a local application.

Three Broad Areas of Research

Members of the Commission on Reading draw on three broad areas of reading research in their report, *Becoming a Nation of Readers* (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott & Wilkinson, 1985). Two of the areas are more or less in line with Kamil's analysis--(1) The Reading Process and (2) Teaching Techniques, Tools and Testing; and a third, Environmental influences on Reading, reflects a particular sensitivity to the importance of cultural and other contextual factors in the acquisition of reading proficiency. The three categories offer another way of directing attention as one approaches the reading literature. The categories can be characterized by a brief review of some of the points Robert Glaser makes in the "Foreword" to the Commission's report.

The Reading Process. Glaser says that "research on the reading process has provided fuller understanding of how children can learn the letter patterns and associated sounds in an alphabetic language such as English, the importance of fluent word recognition, and how a text's structure influences the meaning drawn from it. It has uncovered the roots of proficient reading, and described how the development of well practiced skills in beginning reading foster comprehension of complex texts" (p. v).

The effect of all this is, on the one hand, to confirm and explain certain intuitions and actions of effective practitioners, thereby removing them from further debate, and, on the other hand, to identify practices that are less useful or out of touch with current evidence. Glaser suggests that teachers now have available sufficient knowledge regarding the reading process to permit them to resolve many instruction-related issues. Resolution of issues that have heretofore involved much excursionary quibbling clears the way for getting on with more constructive use of time and effort. A case in point is the "phonics issue." All the evidence says that word recognition and grasping meaning from print are companion skills that must develop concurrently from the very start. The need now is to make instructional decisions that expedite concurrent development of phonics and comprehension skills, not to continue the great phonics debate.

Environmental Influences. By giving explicit attention to environmental influences the Commission acknowledges the importance of contextual factors in teaching/learning to read. Teachers, too, must make this acknowledgment in order to plan instruction that recognizes and takes advantage of the myriad factors of home and family, the larger social/cultural milieu, and the school itself that set the stage and enable (or prescribe) the acquisition of competence to tackle reading tasks of increasing complexity. There is substantial literature to help clarify (1) the role and nurturing of early habits and motivation, (2) the systematic teaching of foundation skills for decoding words, developing vocabulary, inferring meaning from sentences and enjoying stories, and (3) the development of special strategies for comprehending and interpreting textbooks in the subject matter areas.

Teaching Techniques, Tools, and Testing. Research in this category helps to make clear the role and importance of "professional knowledge." Some examples are approaches to pacing, adapting and grouping for instruction; guidelines for designing textbooks, practice exercises and self-study materials; and techniques for directing reading instruction, assessing pupils' progress, and evaluating their reading performance. As Glaser puts it, "In teaching, as in other professions, well-researched methods and tools are essential" (p. vi). Fortunately, the research literature is sufficiently broad and sophisticated to serve as a useful resource to teachers as they make decisions that will guide their day-to-day teaching of reading. But, of course, the teachers must first decide what it is they hope to accomplish.

Systematic . . . and Cautious

One could contemplate many other ways to categorize reading related research. Kamil's two thrusts and the Commission's three broad areas are offered simply as possible lines to follow as teachers begin to seek out areas within the larger body of literature in order to direct attention to matters of particular interest at different times. Emphasis on models and theories of the reading process would, for example, be appropriate when definitions and directions are being set for the overall reading program. Programs that are well grounded in clear conceptions and agreements regarding basic processes are more likely to stand up to scrutiny and to retain support than programs that simply respond to short-term needs. Then, when it is time to seek information for making instructional decisions, the emphasis can be shifted to instruction-oriented research.

Again, the intent here is not to suggest the specific research categories to be used in focusing a literature search but to make two basic points. First, the reading research literature is so vast that approaching it is a formidable task to most practitioners (and to most everyone else, too). As a result they are likely either to approach it in a helter skelter way or to avoid it altogether. They tend to grab a bit here and a bit there and then try to make the pieces fit their needs, or they rely entirely on "experts" to tell them "what the research says." In either case they are almost certain to get a distorted view; and they are unlikely to get the information they need to make specific instructional decisions that are right for them and for their students.

The second point is that practitioners can begin to face the intimidation of a vast literature if they will look for manageable subthemes as they direct attention to matters that concern them.

Or, to put it more starkly, practitioners may be better able to approach the formidable literature of reading if they see that literature for what it is rather than what they hope it might be. It is a rich resource for those with inquiring minds; it is not a storehouse of definitive answers to teachers' questions.

Developing Perspective

Venezky's chapter on the history of reading research in the *Handbook of Reading Research* (1984) is a better source than most for developing a bit of realistic perspective for approaching the research. Among other more serious things, Venezky likens the task of organizing the published research on reading instruction to the twelve labors of Hercules. The collection of works, he says, includes "over 15,000 books, pamphlets, articles, and occasional records of educational verbosity" which amount to "an enduring testimony to the patience of the American printer and the vulnerability of American forests" (p. 17).

He concludes that "to read, comprehend and evaluate even one percent of it is a staggering and not entirely enjoyable task."

Teachers may take some comfort from these words and feel a bit less guilty for not having read and digested all the literature. They may take comfort, too, in Venezky's observation that although many studies were poorly executed, the real problem is discerning why many of them were done at all. Once again the advice is that one who selects carefully from a well-stocked smorgasbord will be better nourished than one who tries to swallow all of it.

Venezky also offers some thoughts on the chasm between research results and actual reading instruction and why it is so difficult to build bridges.

First, adults and not children continue to be the favored subjects in studies of reading processes. Consequently, more is known about the performance of practiced readers than about the acquisition of the ability to perform. Research still does not clarify something so basic as whether poor readers' word-recognition abilities develop through stages that are different from those experienced by good readers or whether they are simply slower in acquisition.

Second, experimental psychologists who work on reading almost never involve themselves in matters of curriculum design and classroom practice. Consequently, the focus of much research is on matters that offer little or no promise of application to instruction. Investigations of learning processes do not necessarily address instructional questions. Acknowledging this simple fact will spare practitioners much of the disappointment they may feel when they see no application for certain research results.

Third, funding agencies often assume, erroneously, that support of basic research will lead directly to improved reading instruction. Basic research may serve its own purpose; but to justify the support of basic research under the guise of instructional improvement only leads to false expectations and disappointment. Venezky cites basic research on letter discrimination as a case in point: the research offers worthwhile insights into visual processing, but there are no major instructional problems associated with letter discrimination.

The perspective that comes from a consideration of points like these should help teachers to see that the chasm between research results and instructional practice is not one of their making, nor is the bridging one for which they can or should take ultimate responsibility. Spared false or unrealistic expectations, teachers will be in a better position to approach the research literature as critical and selective consumers.

Finding the Latest Research

While professional journals like the *Reading Research Quarterly,* the *Journal of Reading Behavior* and the *Journal of*

Educational Research continue to carry most of the current research reports related to reading, there has been a substantial shift to book chapters as a common form for publication of research results, syntheses of lines of research, and exposition of models and theories. A few examples are works edited by Mackinnon and Waller (1981), Pflaum-Connor (1978), Kanowitz (1974), Resnick and Weaver (1979) and Guthrie (1981). Kamil (1984) suggests that the shift toward book chapters--plus a shift away from using formal models to describe and discuss reading processes--may be setting authors free from some of the constraints of journal publication. Because the rules of argument and method that must be observed for successful journal publication may be less stringent for book chapters, authors seem freer to offer more free speculative conclusions and conjectures. As a result, they may offer more interesting and provocative notions to guide further research and tentative application.

This is not to suggest that authors are likely to produce work of inferior quality when they write chapters instead of journal articles. The point is that when authors are set free from certain folk expectations they may be more inclined to deal with larger chunks of information in more ecologically valid settings. When this is so, chapters may be a better source of useful information for planning and improving instruction than the tightly focused and controlled studies typically reported in journals.

One obvious drawback to book chapters as information sources is the longer delay in publication. Most journals offer faster turnaround than books. Fortunately, research institutions usually make technical reports and working papers available as they are produced. Since these are the very reports and papers that often become book chapters, practitioners who seek them out may be able to get previews of coming attractions. Many research institutions maintain regular mailing lists to keep their constituencies informed of works as they become available; and, of course, most of the works are entered in the ERIC system. Teachers should not neglect this important source of current, usable and often creative and forward-looking information.

Published conference proceedings and conference yearbooks are other important and timely sources of research results and research-related discussion. Many institutions, agencies and professional organizations sponsor conferences on selected, often rather narrow topics and publish the proceedings, which tend to be state-of-the-art synthesis, reaction and application papers. Examples of such conferences are the pre-convention institutes held in conjunction with the annual meetings of the International Reading Association and special topics conferences sponsored by such university-affiliated centers as the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State. Publication may be by the agency itself or by an independent publisher. Because usually there is a clearly stated conference theme, these collected proceedings can be the source of coherently organized information on selected topics.

Conference yearbooks typically are the collected--and, increasingly, *selected* by a review process similar to that employed by scholarly journals--papers from the annual meetings of professional organizations. While a given annual meeting may have a "theme," yearbooks generally are not as finely focused as volumes of conference proceedings. Examples are the annual yearbooks of the National Reading Conference and the American Reading Forum. An attractive feature of the yearbooks is that they may include reports of work in progress and even plans for work to be undertaken as well as more traditional research reports and syntheses. Teachers who are aware of work in progress and in planning may be in a position to establish contacts with others who are tackling problems similar to theirs in order to explore possibilities for collaborative efforts as well as to share collaborative insights and findings as they become available.

Summary

Teachers who are interested in taking a research-based stance to improve instruction must approach the vast and varied literature of reading research with a clear purpose and realistic perspective or be inundated by the mass of material that is available. One suggestion offered here is that approaches to the research literature ought to be directed by well-conceived queries and tempered by an abiding sensitivity to local realities and concerns. Action research can help to secure the bridge between researcher and practitioner by bringing local concerns and conditions into sharp focus. Another suggestion is that teachers need to develop a realistic view of "the research in reading." The research is not a collection of ready-made answers to instruction-related questions, waiting to be claimed by eager and trusting teachers. It is a resource which, when approached with purpose and caution, can provide direction and substance for making instructional decisions. A final suggestion is that teachers ought to be aware and make use of the full range of publication vehicles that are in vogue for disseminating research results and synthesis. Just as participation in action research efforts can help teachers keep the focus on research on local views and realities, awareness of what is current can help teachers develop and maintain a sense of involvement in the larger research community. With such involvement practitioners can transcend the traditional view of teachers as passive consumers of research results and become active participants in a better-directed research enterprise.

References

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1985). *Becoming a Nation of Readers.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Borg, W. R. (1981). *Applying Educational Research.* New York: Longman.

Carver, R. P. (1977-1978). Toward a theory of reading comprehension and reading. *Reading Research Quarterly, 13,* 8-63.

Chall, J. S. (1983). *Stages of reading development.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Davis, F. B. (Ed.) (1971). *The literature of research in reading with emphasis on models.* New Brunswick, NJ: Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University.

Fraatz, J. M. B. (1987). *The politics of reading.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gough, P. B. (1972). One second of reading. In J. F. Kavanagh & I. G. Mattingly (Ed.), *Language by ear and eye.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gough, P. B., Alford, J. A., Jr., & Holley Wilcox, P. (1979). Words and contexts.

In M. L. Kamil & A. J. Moe (Eds.), *Reading research: Studies and applications* (Twenty-eighth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference). Clemson, SC: National Reading Conference.

Gough, P. B. & Cosky, M. (1975). One second of reading again. In J. Castellan, D. Pisoni, & G. Potts (Eds.), *Cognitive theory* (Vol. II). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Guthrie, J. T. (Ed.) (1981). *Comprehension and learning: Research reviews.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Herndon, M. A. (1978). An approach toward the development of a functional encoding model of short term memory during reading. *Journal of Reading Behaviors, 10,* 141-148.

Kamil, M. L. (1984). Current traditions of reading research. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research.* New York: Longman.

Kanowitz, B. H. (Ed..) (1974). *Human information processing: Tutorial in* *performance and cognition.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

LeBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1983). A critique of "Toward a theory of automatic information processing." In L. Gentile, M. Kamil, & J. Blanchard (Eds.), *Reading research revisited.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Mackinnon, G. E. & Waller, T. G. (Eds.) (1981). *Reading research: Advances in theory and practice.* Vol 3. New York: Academic Press.

Otto, W. (1985). Research: Practice makes perfect--always, sometimes, never. *Journal of Reading.* 29, 188-191.

Pflaum-Connor, S. (Ed.) (1978). *Aspects of reading education.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Rashotte, C. A. & Torgesen, J. K. (1985). Repeated reading and reading fluency in learning disabled children. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 180-188.

Resnick, L. B. & Weaver, P. A. (1979). *Theory and practice of early reading,* Vol. 2. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rummelhart, D. E. (1977). Toward an interactive model of reading. In S. Dornio (Ed.), *Attention and performance* (Vol. 6). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Singer, J. & Ruddell, R. B. (Eds.) (1970). *Theoretical models and processes of reading.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Singer, H. & Ruddell, R. B. (Eds.) (1976). *Theoretical models and processes of reading.* (2nd ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Singer, H. & Ruddell, R. B. (Eds.) (1986). *Theoretical models and processes of reading.* (3rd ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16,* 37-71.

Venezky, R. L. (1984). The history of reading research. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research.* New York: Longman.

The next three papers contain views expressed during a panel presentation at the Leaders for Literacy Conference.

A PRINCIPAL'S VIEW

Kay Walla

Houston Elementary School

Principals are expected to be building leaders. While keeping curriculum and children at the centermost of what you are doing, you must also be aware of the three B's. You have to keep the *beans* on the lunch table, the *building* hot or cool (depending upon which you want, it's usually the opposite), the *buses* running. Since you have to do so many other things in addition to keeping the curriculum front and center, you must establish priorities and, for me, reading is and has always been a priority. From *A Nation at Risk* and *Becoming a Nation of Readers*, from the *Kappan,* from any newspaper that you pick up, from *Educational Leadership* we are constantly being told we MUST improve the literacy rate and decrease the dropout rate in this country. I don't know how many years you have been in education, but this is my 29th. I have been told that same thing over and over through the years. We have to keep working away on it.

We have to make reading a priority for the able and the disabled. Too long we have been teaching "down the middle." We have to make allowance for those who are more able and those who are disabled. As principals we have to take a stand and decide to do something about reading and learning abilities among all our students.

I have two topics that I would like to share with you today, two points that I would like to make. The first is that the principal can and must lead the effort to improve literacy. Because we are in a leadership position in the building, we can do it and we must do it. The second point I would like to make is that I am convinced that the computer can significantly affect the effort. I will divide my time between those two positions.

How can principals help? I'm going to make some suggestions (that you may be doing already). First, the building principal must be a resource person. You have to be a person that the teacher can walk up to and say, as one did to me during my first week, "I never know how to teach vocabulary. How do you really teach vocabulary?" Well, do you know how to quickly answer that question? You probably can't answer it on the spot, but you have to be the person who knows which journal to go to, which organization to go to, which piece of literature is around that would help. You need to know about the Ohio Council of the International Reading Association. You need to know about the International Reading Association. You need to know your own program well. If you haven't worked through a reading adoption with a committee, you need to do that; we just finished a two-year adoption and we have made tremendous changes. All kinds of things happen while working through a two-year study. With some resource people at Miami University, we have changed our philosophy. We have now come up with not only a newly adopted text but also a philosophy that's coming from the teachers and going to the teachers that says the basal will be only 50% of our reading program. Now you probably know as I do that 90 to 95% of the schools in this nation operate around a basal reading program, but our teachers are saying there are some other things that the literature says make good readers. If you haven't had an opportunity to work through a curriculum adoption study, do so and know your own reading program.

You also need to get to know all the peripherals that go with your reading program. One that is high in my mind right now is computer materials. Which computer materials can support the reading program that we have? What is out there? It may be something the computer will do for you, for your LD program, or for your gifted program.

The next thing I would suggest is impress your parents. (I say that a little bit cautiously today; one of my parents is sitting here in the audience.) Impress parents with your knowledge of and your support for the school reading program. Be able to explain to any parent specific reading test results or reading scores. Be willing to and do discuss in school newsletters and through the PTA ways that parents can provide positive experiences that will assist children learning to read. Show them your positive attitude and they will pick it up. Tell them things they can do at home to support reading.

The next thing that we need to be doing as principals is to observe teachers teaching reading. Have the courage to go in there and watch them do it, and if it's good, give them positive feedback. If it isn't good, vow to do something about it. Again, you are in a power position and if you know that a teacher is really lousing up the reading for some kids, have the courage to do something about it. Evaluate the total school program. If you need to redefine the philosophy, take a leadership role and say "Hey, what are we about here?" You can do it through a needs assessment. You can do it through discussion. A year ago in my school district we did a survey of what we do well and what we don't do well in the school. We asked every employee in the building (the custodian, the cooks, the teachers), a random sampling of all parents and a random sampling of all children: what are we doing well, and what are we not doing so well? Lucky for me, they thought we were doing reading pretty well. So that was not our target. You need to find out and they will tell you what you are doing well and what you are not doing well. When they tell you, you have a basis to go to your Board, to go to your superintendent and say, "Hey, the community thinks we're not doing very well in this area, so let's get on it."

The next thing that you ought to do, and this is very subtle, but you can do it on a daily basis, is create a love for and interest in reading in your building. Be a sponsor. Sponsor marathons, sponsor library week, sponsor book fairs, sponsor Right-to-Read, sponsor everything you can think of that says to the children over a long haul, "This person is a reader. This person really believes in reading."

Encourage your teachers and be involved in things like GRAB time. Do you all know about GRAB time? Go Read A Book. The last ten minutes of each day can be GRAB time; everybody can grab a book. Or the one that we are all familiar with is SSR: Sustained Silent Reading, which you can get involved with at any time. Open libraries. Too many libraries close at 2:30. Why should they? We have a community school. We have a building that's open until 10:00. If somebody needs to come back and get a book out of the library, they can. I am advocating very strongly right now for keeping the school libraries open all summer. Through community education and a small fee from the parents who wish to be involved, we can pay an aide to be in the library two hours a day. Children from the neighborhood, especially from a neighborhood like mine, can walk in and get books. Publish yourself. All leaders need to publish. Publish a newspaper, a newsletter, a weekly bulletin, and always drop in a little comment about reading.

You would be amazed at where you can add a little note or comment in your parent newsletters or bulletins.

Read to your classes. Yes, we have a busy day and we have all these things that have to be done, but every now and then just chuck it and say, "I can't take any more of this busy work. I can't take any more of this paperwork." Pick up a favorite book. (I always keep a table of children's books in my office.) Grab an appropriate book and go down to the first grade room and say, "Could I have your class for 10 or 15 minutes? Go take a break, and I'll read them a story." The teachers will love you. The kids will love you. You will get a break from the stress that's sitting on your desk that you can't get accomplished that day anyway.

Give rewards to kids. Let them know that you care. All the children in my school have the option of keeping their own reading record. I just give them blank sheets of paper: fat spaces for little readers and skinny spaces for big readers. I say, keep a record of what you read and turn it in on the last day of the month. The teacher doesn't have to do anything. It's all the kids. The child who reads the most in every classroom receives a written invitation for lunch with the principal. We'll sit down at lunch together at a table, five-year-olds sitting there with sixth graders. We say, "Hey, teachers, you've got to let them all out at 11:30 today because we're having an Eat-Lunch-with-the-Principal Lunch." They get a certificate, a free ice cream, and they're wonderfully recognized. These are the able readers who are getting rewards for their efforts. Make them a little computer-generated award at no cost, hand it to them, and they love it.

The next thing the principal ought to do is to initiate inservice. Remember, this is a leadership and power position that you have. Do away with the hour of administrivia at your faculty meetings. Do 15 or 20 minutes of what has to get presented. Put the rest in a bulletin and have a good inservice. We had a goal this year to have 30 to 40 minutes inservice at every faculty meeting. The teachers were much more satisfied with the use of the time and got many good ideas. If you have not had inservice this year in whole language, or reading recovery, or cooperative learning, or writing to read, I don't know why not because those are the topics that the teachers are hearing about and need more information about, and you can do it.

The other thing that you can do is to assist teachers in diagnosing students. Sometimes the teacher sees the students as all third graders but one is having a real problem, probably going to get a D again, and she is worried about him. You can assist with some diagnosis. Know an interest inventory or informal reading inventory that you could give. I sometimes give them myself because I just like to know what they are and how to help the teacher know that this child has an easy reading level, an instructional reading level and a challenging reading level.

My second point: get involved with computers. At-risk students in this country are a major concern. That's the new term right now, at-risk. Those of you who have been around for awhile have heard them called a number of different things. There are those who want to read and can't, ought to be able to read, according to their abilities, and can't. I am convinced that computers and carefully selected software can help some of those at-risk students. I have seen it in some of my own research in the Ross School District some years ago. I have seen it in classrooms with my teachers; I know that computers can help. At the other end of the scale, we must support the gifted students. They also need our intervention. How many of you are involved in intervention? That's an awful word at my school. People just absolutely hate it! Good teachers say, "I've been intervening all my life." Well, we have to do some things for the state, and while we're doing them we know that we want to help students who are having trouble as well as those who are not. The computer for the gifted kids, the very able, is a wonderful tool not only for their writing their own material to read but for problem solving, for challenging their minds, for critical thinking, for learning to program. There is no better critical thinking process than learning to program, and the gifted can do it.

One of the buildings in my district is hooked up internationally to ten schools via electronic mail. If you are not into E-Mail yet, you will be in the next five years. Students are talking to other students all over the world. They are writing to kids and they are reading about kids and they are doing projects. They are manipulating data together. For example, they talked to children in the other ten schools and said, "What is your favorite pet?" And they gathered data from students in ten schools in the world and built a data base on favorite pets. They moved onto "Where do you live? The latitude? The longitude?" They built a data base of all the children involved in these ten schools--where they lived, not by name of state or city or country but latitude and longitude. Now they are into an environmental project. All the students are involved in that project: the able, the below level, *all* the fourth graders in that school are involved.

You, as building principal, need to get to know computer literature. There are good reading journals, and there are good computer journals. They include: *Computers in the Classroom, Classroom Computing Teacher,* and *Computers in Reading and Language Arts.* You need to know that material in order to be able to hand a teacher an article about data bases or spreadsheets. I would also encourage you to attend the Ohio Technology Fair, a two-day fair about the state-of-the-art of technology in education, what is coming down the pike and what the recent research has said. The tops in the country in technology are there (in Columbus each year). You need to seek support for computers in classrooms and in laboratories. I've had an ongoing debate in my mind for eight years. Should computers be in the classroom, or should computers be in the laboratory? I have the answer.

They should be in both. Every classroom should have computers and every building should have a laboratory where a teacher can take a total class and go in and teach a skill. You need to appeal to both. By 1990, as you probably have heard, 90% of the jobs will be computer-related. We have to be an advocate for computers. Cost is a non-issue. Districts can afford what they want to afford. My experience has been probably like yours in that the PTA has furnished all that we have--wonderful! But from now on, starting this year, principals are ordering more; this principal is ordering four; this principal is getting three; this principal is getting two. Support computer users in the building. Find those teachers who are willing to take the risk and support them heavily. Let them network with other teachers and move on. Please, please, eliminate from your school vocabulary "We've never done it that way before." The computer is an informational appliance. It belongs in a mainstream of education and it is your job and my job to be sure that every student has equal access to the many different kinds of uses. Notice that I said every student--black, white, male, female; technology removes human biases. We need to know how to make the many ethical decisions involved with computers. Most of all we need to know how to help the teacher individualize instruction for the abled and the disabled through the many things computers can do such as teach remedial learners, tutor, assist with problem solving, simulate situations and give demonstrations, word process (writing, drafting, rewriting), manipulate data, store information, manage student records, etc. The computer can change the reading curriculum as well as the rest of the school curriculum. We must infuse it as an integrated tool for the computer is motivating and the literature has already shown that it can do some things better and faster than any other way. I urge you to give up some of the 70% of the time that we spend in seat work. Have the children writing at the computer. They can do it. This year in my own school every child from kindergarten through sixth grade is word processing. I had a computer representative in my building (each building has a computer rep) and mine came to me a year ago and said, "I think first and second graders can use Apple Works. I don't think it's right that we teach them Bank Street Writer and in two years switch them to Apple Works." I said, "Go to it. If the first grade teacher will let you borrow them to teach them." And she did. As the first grade teacher told me, "What a team we were. I was scared to death of computers and she was scared to death of first graders." She was a sixth grade teacher. She said, "By the time the year was over we had high respect for each other." Once a month we pulled all the computers into the lab and said this is the week when we bring groups into the lab and we teach them. This sixth grade teacher had her sixth grade students monitoring (cooperative learning) as she coordinated the lab with the first grade teacher handling the behavior of the kids when she taught them Apple Works. The only problem they had--their arms weren't long enough to reach the on-off switch on the Apple keyboard. I said "Get up out of your chair, walk around there, turn it on, and you've got it licked." And they did. They were all writing their stories in short order.

We have to help teachers to speak to publishers. We have to tell publishers what's good and bad about software, just as we tell them about textbooks. Teachers need the courage to write to the person who wrote the software and say,"This is lousy. I would never buy this. Here is what you need to do to fix it." Order software for teachers and say it's here for a 30-day preview. Route it around. If two or three teachers say that it's good, buy it. If two or three teachers say its bad, send it back. Every good software publisher will let you do that. Provide inservice in the many computer uses; I think that I personally have been able to get to teachers, children, administrators, college professors, everybody that I have worked with in staff development through word processing. First do word processing because that's something everybody has a need for and everybody can do. Then move on into data base, spreadsheets, applications and curricular infusion.

Let me summarize by saying we need to provide leadership in assisting the able and the disabled in both reading and computers. We must be an advocate first for children, always for reading, and for computers right now. Your attitude and your actions are going to make a difference. How can you begin? Here are a couple of things you can do. If you don't belong to IRA, join. You get some good journals, you can go to state and international conferences, and you receive a newspaper with at least one article for administrators and parents. If you don't belong to the state council of the International Reading Association Council, join. Attend the annual conference and mingle with a thousand or more reading teachers and professors. Get memberships for your school.

Use the computer yourself. Vow that if you haven't, you're going to. When the children and teachers walk back in the building in the fall, let them see you modeling. I am convinced that 90% of the learning in this world is done by modeling anyway. If they see you using it for data management, record-keeping, word processing, inventory, or whatever, they will respect you for doing it and you can model the way. So, please let us administrators make a difference.

GETTING REAL: FORMING COLLABORATIVE ALLIANCES

Jo Anne Vacca
Kent State University

The watch word today is "collaboration." Educators often talk about doing things collaboratively. Consider these two definitions for the word "collaborate:" 1) to work jointly with others, 2) to cooperate with or willingly assist an enemy. The first conveys what we hope will happen when we talk about a collaborative project; we want to work jointly. Our goal is to work jointly with public school professionals to improve instruction. We want to develop reflective practitioners who will reflect in context on context. I think that's really what we have an opportunity to do at conferences like Leaders for Literacy: engage in a little reflection.

The second definition, however, makes us think of an enemy. I'm sure we've all found ourselves in leadership positions where things were not going smoothly.

Every morning I go to the same little coffee shop in Hudson, Ohio. I buy the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* and mind my own business while sitting in a booth having a cup of coffee before I go off to work. One morning in early June I overheard a conversation. A man I'll call Jeffrey was giving our waitress some free advice. Jeffrey had found out that the waitress, who appeared to be about 18 years old, was going to be attending a small private college. "Now, I just want to tell you one thing. Make sure that you get a skill. I sent my daughter to college and I had to turn around and send her back to business school so she could learn how to type. Now you make sure you get a skill." Not satisfied, Jeffrey added still more, "And let me tell you one more thing. I don't mean teaching, because those who can't, teach."

Although the adage is an old one, it stung. I felt even sadder and wondered about prospective college students. What do we do to our own students by sending these mixed messages? I think too that we as teachers receive mixed messages from the public and, sometimes, from our own colleagues.

While I believe we need to bring all of our teaching staffs and administrators "up to snuff" on computers, and, of course, on whole language instruction, I cannot say that I have 20 ways to provide inservice. I really think that things are much more complex than a decade ago; teachers are now the ones that are at risk. In 1976 I began researching some of the literature on what we used to call "inservice" and now regularly call "staff development" or "professional development." I wrote an article that appeared in the *Journal of Reading*: "How to be an Effective Staff Developer for Content Area Teachers." I focused on a single inservice session or a series of sessions and analyzed effective sessions. What were some of the components that came together and caused the participants to feel that they got something worthwhile out of the session?

Could we identify what those were? I still feel confident that we could all probably agree right now on what are some characteristics of effectiveness.

In a recent writing process project near Cleveland we employed a traditional staff development model. I would espouse a traditional kind of training model, if you will, when you have some really substantive knowledge that needs to be shared. Let's say it's about writing or it's about computers. Allow the participants an opportunity to try out the innovation and then change whatever it is they're going to implement in the classroom. The model works well, assuming that the knowledge we're trying to expand upon is something worthwhile and that most of the teachers agree that is what they would like.

Today, when I think about staff development and working with teachers collaboratively, I think about the concept of forming alliances. How can we bring together colleges, universities, and public schools: Do all parties really see the benefits of an alliance? I don't mean, as important as it is, the placement of prospective teachers in the public schools. But what is it that professors can learn from public school environments and what can public school teachers and administrators learn from working with colleges and universities?

One answer is the notion of the empowerment of teachers. In his new book, *The Empowerment of Teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence*, Gene Mayeroff explains that what he means by *empowerment* is somewhat synonymous with *professionalization*. It doesn't necessarily mean being in charge; it means working in an environment in which a teacher acts as a professional and is treated as a professional. The inevitable result then is empowerment. First, boosting status is fundamental to the process. I couldn't help but think back to the low status of teachers expressed by Jeffrey in the coffee shop when I read this excerpt: "While professionals in other fields are used to being treated to lunch and taking others to lunch, teachers hardly ever get so much as a free cup of coffee. Expense accounts are the erotica of another planet. Teachers in New York City even have [had] to punch time clocks as if they worked on an assembly line in a factory. In Chicago where there are no time clocks, they sign in and out in log books in the school's main office, a procedure not unusual around the country" (p. 21).

The second guiding principle of empowerment is making teachers more knowledgeable. Indeed, everyone needs to be kept abreast of the latest research on writing, computer instruction, and so on. Allowing teachers access to the "lofty towers of power" means building psychological ladders they may climb to escape their isolation and gain an overview. All this relates to the concept of forming alliances.

I recall a couple of people who had an impact on my attempts to define collaboration. The first has been a superintendent for about 25 years in northeast Ohio. Last year he attended a college-sponsored breakfast for local superintendents. At one point during that fascinating morning, he stood up and told those of us from "higher education" a few things. He said, "Yes, you may come into our schools; I am not opposed to that." And about the new projects we wanted to try, he said, "That would be okay. But we really don't want you to just come in, stay a couple of weeks, and then leave. We want to know if you're for real." His was a straightforward manner; it made me think he had heard the old saying that the university has learned how to talk to itself. He didn't want that. If we wanted to talk to ourselves, that wouldn't be real; we might as well stay where we were. On the other hand, he was extending an invitation--if we were up to the challenge, he would let us in.

At the Second Annual Holmes Group National Conference I heard Ann Lieberman, whose new book, *Building a Professional Culture in Schools,* had just been published. A quote from Myrna

Cooper's chapter seemed to make good sense:

> In the final analysis there is no professional culture for teachers save what is conferred through their students. If participating in the profession, in decision-making, in the rights of power and control helps children, then a professional culture will have meaning (1988, p. 54).

We are, after all, dealing with attitude, the respect that we engender in others, the respect that we need when we try to form alliances. Public school teachers and university professors need respect for each other. We have a lot of growing to do on both ends. If we want to affirmatively respond to the question, "Are you going to be for real?" there is no time for mixed messages.

In closing, let's reflect with *The Velveteen Rabbit:*

> "Real isn't how you are made," said the skin horse. "It's a thing that happens to you. When a child loves you for a long,

long time, not just to play with, but really loves you, then you become real."

"Does it hurt?" asked the rabbit.

"Sometimes," said the skin horse, for he was always truthful. "When you are real, you don't mind being hurt."

"Does it happen all at once like being wound up, or bit by bit?"

"It doesn't happen all at once," said the skin horse. "You become. It takes a long time. That's why it doesn't often happen to people who break easily or have sharp edges or who have to be carefully kept. Generally by the time you are real, most of your hair has been lopped off and your eyes drop out and you get loose in the joints and very shabby, but those things don't matter at all because once you are real you can't be ugly except to people who don't understand." (p. 13).

References

Cooper, M. (1988). Whose culture is it anyway? In A. Lieberman (Ed..), *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Vacca, J. L. (1983). How to be an effective staff developer for content area teachers. *Journal of Reading, 26*, 293-296.

Williams, M. (1979). *The Velveteen Rabbit*. New York: Avon Books.

SETTING REALISTIC STANDARDS

Richard Vacca
Kent State University

A couple weeks ago I saw a wonderful movie titled *Big*. In *Big*, there's a 12-year-old boy who is on the verge of puberty and he's trying to impress a 16-year-old who won't have anything to do with him, especially this one night at a carnival. While he is at the carnival he plays this one machine, which is called "Make Your Wish." He wishes he could be big. Of course, the next morning he is big. If I had to play that machine and I had one wish, I guess my one wish right now would be never to make the distinction between disabilities and abilities. I think that distinction creates standards that are wrong and inappropriate for the way learners learn language and for the way readers and writers develop.

I am going to focus in the 15 minutes that I have on the at-risk reader. That's not to say that there are not children struggling or having trouble with reading and writing. They are at risk, but that at riskness does not mean a permanent condition. Once we look at disability we get into our heads often that is a permanent condition or state of being. In fact, any one of us at any time knows that we have been at risk as a reader and a writer. One of the things that happens when we create standards that are dead wrong in light of what we know about language and learning is a creation of standards that get translated into curriculum. More than any other single factor today, I think, is the way our curriculum puts kids at risk with reading and writing. I would like to focus a little bit on that.

Flying for me is one of the worst activities that I could participate in, but whenever I do fly, I always look for something to read. I had forgotten to bring some reading material on a trip that I was making so I was forced to read the airline magazine and I'm glad that I did. There was a great column called

Communication written by Bishop Ernest Fitzgerald. The title of the piece that he did for Communication was "Things Worth Keeping." There is a little story that the good bishop tells. It has a lot to do with the way we look at readers and writers today. The story begins: "There is an old and silly story about a fellow who was riding his motorcycle on a cold day. The zipper on his jacket was broken. So, the rider stopped and put his jacket on backwards to shield himself from the wind. A bit later the rider had an accident and was knocked unconscious. He stayed in the hospital for weeks. The doctors said that the boy wasn't hurt much in the wreck, but he was severely injured when the policeman tried to turn his head around to match his jacket. "

Standards are important. We live by standards. Standards set expectations for us. In fact, the policeman's expectation was that a person's zipper is always on the front of his body. Don't we do the same things with kids who are at risk? Don't we try to turn their heads to match a curriculum that just doesn't work for them because the standards are dead wrong? We need standards because they are reference points, but look what happens when a state like Texas, for example, has mandated what those standards are going to be for reading and writing and they provide state tests. What is everyone doing? Teaching for the tests. Today all over the country more and more I see testing driving the literacy curriculum. It is dead wrong, especially when we have such ridiculous notions about what should be tested.

Why do we put children at risk? What do children need to know about reading and learning? I think these become very fundamental questions that all of us in our ways have to respond to. For me a child has to know what reading is and what reading is for or what writing is and what writing is for. Part of developing as literate people is to get that concept firmly in mind.

Editor's Note: Dr. Vacca then went on to show a passage on the overhead projector. Because of the unusual way words were used, it was nearly incomprehensible, until he shared the context, brought out prior knowledge, clarified vocabulary and concepts. He concluded with a discussion of the implications for testing and improving literacy in our schools.

THE VIEW FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT

SISTER MARY ANN CORR, S. C.
Diocese of Steubenville, Ohio

The role of an educational administrator, whether an elementary or secondary principal or a district or diocesan superintendent, is multi-faceted. So even goals as important as improving the components of the language arts program and integrating reading, writing, listening and speaking into the other areas of the curriculum have to be juggled with staff development, balancing a budget, public relations, and educational policies.

Nonetheless, the superintendent must provide leadership to encourage the participation of personnel in working toward the goal of an improved language arts and content area literacy program.

In the Diocese of Steubenville, the improvement of the language arts curriculum is a goal to be completed over the next two school years. There are eighteen elementary schools and three secondary schools in the diocese. One additional professional member of the staff, the Coordinator of Education in the diocese, will assist me with the goal. We will both provide guidance and support to principals and teachers as they concentrate on improvement of all aspects of the language arts programs in diocesan schools.

This goal is being coordinated with the need to revise our language arts course of study. After five years of use, it must be revised, according to state mandate.

The following activities were initiated during 1987-88 as preliminary steps to the goal to improve language arts.

1. General areas of weakness in the language arts course of study were identified during meetings with language arts teachers. These meetings were scheduled throughout the year during school visits made by the Office of Education staff.
2. In the Spring of 1988 I worked with a committee of reading teachers who had volunteered to

assist in identifying formal measures of reading competency. These teachers will become the nucleus of the Language Arts Course of Study Revision Committee. In the Fall of 1988, additional teachers and administrators were asked to volunteer for this committee. Teachers and administrators who work on committees are not reimbursed for their services. Committee meetings are scheduled during the school days. The Office of Education supplies funds to pay for substitutes for the teachers and travel costs for teachers and administrators. Meeting with Diocesan personnel, this committee revised the course of study during the school year.

3. In May, 1988, at the Diocesan principals' meeting, I presented an inservice on strengthening the integrated language arts program.

> During the presentation, the importance of involving persons other than educators in the plan to improve language arts was reviewed. Regular communication through oral and written announcements, including newsletters, keep parents and members of local communities interested in the instructional improvement plans. In my role as superintendent, I write a biweekly column in the diocesan newspaper entitled: *Listening and Speaking: From the Superintendent's Office.* Activities and conclusions reached during the two-year language arts improvement plan will be regularly reviewed in this column. Readers are encouraged to respond to this column.

Principals are reminded that since the improvement of language arts instruction is our essential aim, teachers would benefit from a review of specific and pertinent points.

Suggestions for inservice meetings to emphasize reading improvement focus on the following:

Reading - 1. Background experience of students is always essential. Having concepts presented in a story acted out by students, or using related tactile activities with the students can be helpful.

2. Vocabulary introduced or reinforced in a story must always be presented within contextual sentences.

3. With few exceptions, guided silent reading is essential at every grade.

    a. In using Directed Reading Thinking Activities students can be motivated to read to answer their own questions.

4. Oral re-reading is essential for developing oral fluency.

    a. It should be part of every reading lesson in first and second grade and throughout most of the year in third grade for students who need fluency practice.

b. After third grade oral reading by students should only be done occasionally and selectively except for those students who need practice in reading with fluency.

5. Word Recognition Skills, i.e. and structural analysis are important, and should be sequentially developed with the aid of workbooks and complemented by hands-on activities.

6. Enrichment activities should be promoted. Independent reading or extended research about a subject should be encouraged for all students. High teacher expectation is a strong motivation for students.

7. Teachers need to identify reading levels when students are engaged in varied types of reading. The reading levels listed below are generally accepted as appropriate by reading specialists.

	Comprehension	Word Recognition
a. Independent	90% or higher	99% or higher
b. Instructional	75% to 90%	95% to 99%
c. Frustration	Below 75%	Below 95%

In addition to reading, other components of language arts -- writing, listening and speaking -- should be integrated into lessons in all subject areas taught by content area teachers. When appropriate, inservice on integrating language arts skills within content area instruction should be provided to teachers.

Writing - 1. Use oral language skills to strengthen writing skills. The Language Experience Approach (where students first tell the story orally and then either write or have others write their spoken words) strengthens writing ability and other skills.

2. Use many varied formal and informal writing assignments to encourage and strengthen student writing.

3. Organize writing folders for all students in grades K to 12: Select best samples for narrative, expository and persuasive writing and save them for all students from year to year.

4. Teach and define essential terms related to the writing process.
   a. Prewriting - everything you do before you write
   b. Writing - first draft
   c. Rewriting - several drafts and then the final draft
   d. Purpose - why you write
   e. Audience - to whom you write
   f. Voice - formal or informal, related to purpose and audience.

Listening -1. Use frequently for both formal and informal activities e.g., giving instructions.

2. Teach students to question properly using literal,

inferential, creative or interpretive questions.

3. Have students read the lines, between the lines, and beyond the lines.

Speaking - Encourage varied opportunities in all content subjects: e.g., extemporaneous speeches, debates, panels, oral reports and choral activities.

Many of the suggestions listed by Baumann (1984) can be used during reading instruction. They may also be applied to other areas of language arts instruction.

1. If you are a principal, reading specialist, or reading coordinator, be an instructional leader. Guide your faculty in the development of your school reading program.
2. Take responsibility for teaching and learning, have confidence in your ability to instruct, assume your students are capable of learning, and expect them to learn.

3. Have objectives for every lesson you teach, know what they are, and communicate them to your students.
4. Allocate enough time for reading instruction.
5. Keep nonengaged and transition time to a minimum; that is, keep your students on task.
6. Establish high success rates; success does breed success.
7. Be an effective classroom manager--be organized and prevent misbehavior.
8. Monitor student learning, provide feedback, and reteach when necessary.
9. Administer direct instruction; that is, you teach the lessons. Do not expect textbooks, workbooks, games, or media to teach.
10. Use traditional reading groups, but individualize within and between groups.
11. Strive for a warm, non-threatening, convivial classroom

atmosphere; students will learn better when they are in a structured but secure environment.

During our May meeting, results of an extensive study by Venezky and Winfield (1979) were shared with diocesan principals. The researchers support the interactive role of the principal. They identified leadership styles as existing on a continuum between task-oriented and those promoting human relations. Initially, they thought that the principal who is strongly committed to building human relations throughout the school community would be the best type of administrator. However, they found that in both urban and rural schools the primary trait of the administrator who has a successful reading program is achievement or task-oriented. It appears that good human relations are important along with an emphasis on doing the job well.

The following points are a summary of the research of Venesky and Winfield (1979). They found that principals who are achievement-oriented:

a. have a strong desire to improve the reading program and actively communicate this desire to teachers, students and parents.

b. concentrate on the task of improving the reading program.

c. schedule sufficient time for the task, provide sufficient teaching materials, and coordinate the assistance of supplemental staff to the best advantage of the reading program.

d. promote instructional efficiency through both adaptability and consistency of instruction.

Throughout the next two school years, principals in the Diocese of Steubenville will be encouraged to focus on observing instruction of the language arts curriculum during periods of teacher observations. As the Coordinator of

Education visits schools, she will also observe teachers during reading class instruction. Results of the observations of over 250 teachers will be compiled and analyzed by the Coordinator and myself to determine areas of strength and weakness. The summary report of strong and weak areas of language arts instruction throughout the diocese will be shared with diocesan principals, who will then communicate these results to local school communities.

During the second year teachers will participate in inservices on methods of both formal and informal research methods. Following these inservices, teachers will be encouraged to initiate projects within diocesan classrooms to further investigate the findings of the summary reports of observations of language arts instruction in the diocese. It is expected that successful methods of instruction will be identified. Also lists of textbooks or materials which have been used to promote positive results in language arts instruction will be compiled.

A future goal relating to research activity is to establish an ongoing professional relationship with a local university in Ohio.

References

Baumann, James C. (November, 1984) "Implications for reading instruction from the research on teacher and school effectiveness." _Journal of Reading,_ vol. 28, p. 113.

Venezky, Richard L. and Winfield, Linda (1979). _Schools that Succeed Beyond Expectations in Teaching Reading_. Newark, DE: University of Delaware.

The following four papers were written by Heckert Center faculty to share with participants at the Leaders for Literacy Conference.

POETRY IN THE READING PROGRAM: A GOAL FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

EILEEN TWAY
Miami University

One goal for school administrators in improving the teaching of reading in their schools is to see that plenty of good "reading" is available in classrooms. The possibilities are almost limitless. We have a wealth of books today that are known to promote good reading: interesting, well-written, easy-to-read books, predictable books, cumulative tales, repetitive stories, wordless or almost-wordless books that ensure beginning success, and inviting collections of poetry. Hoskisson and Tompkins (1987) say that one type of book is especially effective to

---

Eileen Tway presents useful information to administrators interested in building up poetry collections for children, teachers and themselves.

assist children with beginning reading: predictable books. "They contain repetitive phrases or sentences, repetitive sentences in a cumulative structure or sequential events that make them easier for young children to read" (pp. 28-29). All of these kinds of predictable structures are important, i.e., repetition, sequence, etc., and books that feature them belong in the classroom library as an integral part of a viable reading program. One kind of literature that features these structures as well or better than any other kind is poetry.

Poetry seems to have it all: rhythm, predictability, repetition, succinctness, and quick closure. Poems can be quite short and enable readers to have control over choices and to experience success in short, successive readings. Older readers as well as beginning readers benefit from poetry as reading material. Lee Bennett Hopkins (1987) says, "In upper grades, poetry has served as an excellent stimulus to better reading and nurtures a love of words. I have used poetry with slow readers in my classes--readers who could not possibly get through a long story or novel but who could understand and relish the message a poem conveys. Poems, being short, are not demanding or frustrating to these readers." (p. 6). Hopkins also says that children are natural poets, and poetry seems to be a good place to begin if we are to put natural language learning at the heart of the curriculum.

Don Holdaway (1988) says that we must put the natural joy of teaching and learning back into the reading program. If we do that, he says, we won't need to sugar coat our lessons or try to make them "fun." Enjoyment and satisfaction will develop naturally with good reading selections.

Sing A Song of Popcorn: Every Child's Book of Poem's is a great place to start because it is a modern anthology around which a teacher can build a fine classroom library. Illustrated by nine Caldecott award-winning artists, this book will promote poetic and visual literacy, and will bring joy in reading.

Other books to investigate include the following:

All Small. Poems by David McCord. Illustrations by Madelaine Gill Linden. Boston: Little, Brown, 1986. These small poems by the National Poetry Award-winning poet, David McCord, are about everyday subjects that intrigue children: snow-man, snail, rain, secret, etc.

Best Friends. Poems Selected by Lee Bennett Hopkins. Illustrated by James Watts. New York: Harper and Row, 1986. Hopkins has chosen excellent poets who have written simple but substantial poems about a topic important to childhood, "best friends." Poets include Margaret Hillert, Charlotte Zolotow, Langston Hughes, and Gwendolyn Brooks.

Dogs & Dragons, Trees & Dreams. A Collection of Poems by Karla Kuskin. New

York: Harper and Row, 1980. The graphics and illustrations of this delightful book lend themselves to early reading enjoyment. Karla Kuskin is both a poet and an artist of note. Her humorous poems and illustrations appeal to children.

Every Time I Climb A Tree. Poems by David McCord. Illustrated by Marc Simont. Boston: Little, Brown, 1980. Twenty-five poems for young people represent McCord at his best with his great, inimitable word fun.

Long Ago In Oregon. Poems by Claudia Lewis. Pictures by Joel Fontaine. New York: Harper and Row, 1987. These poems are about a young girl's growing up long ago in Oregon and will give readers a glimpse of American life of the early Twentieth Century, of holidays, and small townlife.

Something Sleeping in the Hall. An I Can Read Book. Poems by Karla Kuskin. New York: Harper and Row, 1985. Karla Kuskin's wonderful sense of humor is delightfully evident in these short, imaginative, and rhythmical poems.

The Star in the Pail. Poems by David McCord. Illustrated by Marc Simont. Boston: Little, Brown, 1986. Beautifully illustrated and spaced on the pages of this book, these poems by David McCord invite reading with their compelling rhyme, rhythm, and humor.

Surprises. An I Can Read Book. Poems selected by Lee Bennett Hopkins. Illustrated by Megan Lloyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1984. This easy-to-read book of poems includes outstanding poets, such as Aileen Fisher, Myra Cohn Livingston, Carl Sandburg, and Christina Rossetti, whose poems are accessible to early readers who can appreciate them at beginning levels of sophistication.

More Surprises is a companion book to *Surprises*, and it is also an I Can Read Book with poems selected by Lee Bennett Hopkins. New York: Harper and Row, 1987. This follows the same format as *Surprises,* with short, simple poems, colorful illustrations, and well-known poets represented.

These Small Stones. Poems selected by Norma Farber and Myra Cohn Livingston. New York: Harper and Row, 1987. This collection is about the small things, real and imagined, of the world. It shows children that poetry can be about any subject, especially subjects of vital interest to them, such as a firefly, a jumping bean, caterpillars, themselves.

The above list contains anthologies or collections of poems by many poets and also books of poems by individual poets. It is important to have this kind of variety plus a variety of subjects represented so that the poetry library gives children experience with different kinds of poetry books and accommodates a wide range of children's interests. A key to getting children to read is to provide a variety of interesting material to read.

References Cited in Text

deRegniers, Beatrice Schenk and others, eds. *Sing A Song of Popcorn: Every Child's Book of Poems.* New York: Scholastic, 1988.

Holdaway, Don. "Towards Joyful Language Teaching." unpublished talk, 12th World Congress on Reading, Australia, July 6, 1988.

Hopkins, Lee Bennett. *Pass the Poetry, Please!* Revised Edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

Hoskisson, Kenneth, and Gail E. Tompkins. *Language Arts: Content and Teaching Strategies.* Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1987.

Additional Resources

Larrick, Nancy. *A Parent's Guide To Children's Reading.* Revised 5th edition. New York: Bantam, 1982. See Chapter 7, "Poetry Is For Everyone."

Smith, Richard J. *Using Poetry To Teach Reading and Language Arts: A Handbook for Elementary School Teachers.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1985.

POINT-COUNTERPOINT: TEXTBOOK ADOPTION

ALAN FRAGER and
MAUREEN VANTERPOOL
Miami University

School administrators are always involved in textbook adoptions, which are important because textbook programs often define school curricula, dictating what is taught, in what sequence, and for how long. Recently, education groups have criticized school textbooks for being too boring, incoherent, and "dumbed-down." Viewed from one perspective the selection of better textbooks seems to offer little hope for improving the school reading program because in some ways textbooks inhibit the teaching of thinking. Viewed from a different perspective textbooks may offer the potential for a lot of

---

In this paper Alan Frager and Maureen Vanterpool agree to disagree about the value of textbooks.

improvement in the reading program, if they are stimulating, well written, and challenging enough to engage student interest. Administrators looking to improve the reading programs in their schools may reasonably ask, "What are the advantages and disadvantages of using textbooks?" This point-counterpoint discussion focuses on four issues involved in answering that question.

Encyclopedic or comprehensive?

Point: Textbooks are encyclopedic. Because textbooks must be the source of all possible topics to be covered in a class, they include a little information on many topics, but discuss none in depth. Teaching for thinking requires the opposite approach. To perform higher order cognitive skills like analysis and synthesis in a subject area students need in-depth knowledge of that area, the kind of knowledge gained from reading many different viewpoints on the subject.

Counterpoint: Textbooks are comprehensive. They provide an overview of topics related to the course of study, showing relative importance of interrelated topics and placing those topics in perspective. The scope of the curriculum would be inordinately restricted without the breadth of content provided by textbooks. In this information age, developing thinking skills would pose too great a challenge with a curriculum that is narrow in scope due to limited information. Every topic does not require extensive study, and any topic can be used as a departure point for further study, often facilitated by reference lists provided by the authors. Higher order cognitive skills can and should be applied to topics as they are treated within a textbook, as with other reading materials.

Primary sources vs. efficient compilations

Point: Textbooks are not primary sources. They are written by authors who read the current reports of knowledge in an area (primary sources) and also the commentaries on those current reports (secondary sources) and then write a third-hand, supposedly easy-to-read version of the current state of knowledge in a field. This approach is inimical to teaching thinking because it asks students and teachers to accept the notion that knowledge should be broken down into predigested chunks before it can be swallowed. Because it takes considerable time for the experts to read, digest, and rewrite the current state of knowledge in an area, textbooks are always at least two years out of date. In contrast, teaching for thinking helps students develop an appetite for the most current primary sources of knowledge in an area and an ability to digest the knowledge for themselves.

Counterpoint: Textbooks are efficient compilations of source materials. They represent analysis and synthesis of a wealth of information, which would otherwise be unavailable or too technical for classroom use. It would be unreasonable to expect teachers and students to sift through the raw data from which textbook information is derived. Textbooks present these data in forms which are more appropriate to the realities of classrooms. Development of thinking skills would be frustrated if students and teachers always had to go directly to technical reports, professional papers, or archival documents for first-hand information.

Expensive or cost effective?

Point: Textbooks are expensive. To justify the investment needed to purchase high priced textbooks, students must use the books year after year. Ironically, the inflated cost of textbooks actually lowers their value as resources for thinking. To protect the school's investment in the books, students are prohibited from writing reactions in them, from highlighting memorable passages, and from taking the books outside of school to read, study, or share. The lesson taught by such textbook use is that important knowledge is heavy, permanently bound, property of the school, and intended to remain in an unused condition for as long as possible. How different this is from lessons taught by our favorite tradebooks, journals, and newspapers.

Counterpoint: Textbooks are cost effective. If the cost of textbooks is compared to the cost of obtaining original sources, then it is clearly less expensive to purchase textbooks. Few, if any, school systems would be able to afford adequate materials if they had to purchase or duplicate class sets of original sources. Furthermore, school systems would not be able to afford textbooks if they were consumable. While students don't gain pride of ownership, they learn to think about textbooks as useful and durable sources of information, which provide continuity to the curriculum.

Authors: known and unknown

Point: Textbooks are written by unknown authorities. In contrast to trade books, which are often chosen by readers who know of the author's expertise and biases by reputation or prior experience, textbooks are assumed to be written by experts without bias, although neither students nor teachers usually have the slightest knowledge of the authors or their reputation. In fact, some textbooks are written by committees and the names of the writers are not even identified. Because of this what is lost in textbook reading is critical thinking, the weighing of the logic of the ideas against the known level of bias and expertise of the author.

Counterpoint: Textbooks are written by knowledgeable and experienced content specialists in collaboration with pedagogical specialists. Whether the authors are known or unknown, textbooks should be read as critically as any other reading materials. As with other materials, readers should expect textbooks to reflect the author's biases as well as cultural biases, which became evident with increased awareness of stereotypes in texts. Identifying bias in textbooks contributes to developing thinking skills.

Conclusion

Textbook adoption decisions should be based on the goals of the reading program. If the goals of the school reading program include developing critical thinking, hunger for learning, personal interaction with books, and in-depth exploration of subjects, choosing better textbooks may yield little gain. Perhaps the first move which should be made is to involve teachers in deciding how valuable textbooks are now and could be in the future. Because the debate on the value of textbooks will be with us for a long time, enlightened administrators will weigh both sides of the argument as they contemplate textbook adoption.

CHILDREN'S LANGUAGE

ANDREW V. JOHNSTON and
ELIZABETH B. JOHNSTON
Miami University

The principal reached out and took the arm of a six-year-old walking down the hall. "Oh, Ali, I'm so sorry about your lizard! Thank you for telling us about it. Will you be sure and write another story when you get your new one?"

"Yes'm". With a grin that further lightened the bright, colorful hallway, Ali hurried to join the end of the lunch line.

The building principal and the visitor walked along the primary hallway, each side of which was covered with examples of children's writing, a few illustrated by colorful, freeform drawings, most unaccompanied. The second and third grade portions contained only handwritten

---

Ways of increasing school literacy through children's writing are shared by Andrew and Elizabeth Johnston.

manuscripts (some in cursive) on an immense variety of subjects.

The principal stopped before the first grade section of the display. "Look at this! Here's Ali's story."

Ali had written on a computer, "My lizard was gren and it was namd Petr. And mommie cook it when she left it in the hot sun. And it was sad. And he is still in our backyard. We buryd him. Mommie said she would get me another one but she didn't do it yet."

The principal in this building does not suffer from confusion regarding the priorities of her instructional program (Laffey, 1980). Studies during the past twenty years have focused extensively on principals' role in reading instruction (Laffey, 1980 and Hillerich, 1983). A consistent finding relates to the quality of leadership. One study identified four areas of leadership: 1) directing and controlling, 2) stimulating and initiating, 3) analyzing and appraising and 4) designing and implementing (Laffey, 1980). The principal in Ali's school focuses about 80%

of her attention on stimulating and initiating reading behavior. This principal had established a climate among teachers and students in a large urban elementary school that placed the highest value on reading. The program required that all children write and made exciting provisions for this. As part of the encouragement to write, children knew that, among others, the principal read what they wrote. She also provided time for children to visit other rooms and read their stories to appreciative audiences. From first grade on, children write, first with the computer as a tool, then with pen or pencil and paper. All writings are displayed on a wall and children and teachers are encouraged to read and acknowledge these ever changing displays.

This school implements selected recommendations of the Commission on Reading: "Children should spend less time completing workbooks and skill sheets." (Commission on Reading, 1985, p. 119). The focus of this program is on children writing. From kindergarten to 6th grade, students write: stories, reports, letters, and most of the writing is read by other students, teachers, the principal and visitors to the school. Workbooks, hardly in evidence, are occasionally used to reinforce specific techniques. "Children should spend more time in independent reading" and "schools should maintain well-stocked and managed libraries." (Commission on Reading, 1985 p. 119). In addition to encouragement and providing time for reading what other children are writing, each class is scheduled into the library each week. Here the librarian tells stories and provides time for children to select books to take back to their rooms. Students from the upper grades are also encouraged to use the library on a regular basis and do so freely. In the week the visitor spent in the building, punctuated by trips to and from classrooms approximately every twenty-five minutes, only one period was noted in which there were no children in the library. (The upper grades were having an assembly.)

The Commission on Reading (1985, p. 119) had as another recommendation: "Schools should cultivate an ethos that supports reading." Hillerich (1983) stated that the role of the principal was to grease the skids for building a quality reading program by scheduling time for reading, reducing interruptions and, above all, valuing reading by personal actions.

Sanacore (1988) observes that test results, important as they are, are only one piece of evidence of a good reading program. The amount of independent reading done where children are applying techniques learned may be the most meaningful indicator of a quality program.

Children learn to use their language by using it, making mistakes, but getting a portion of their message across and having other communicators respond. Responses may well be requests for further information, repetition of the basic message or elaboration of the message. The point is that children must practice; over and over, again and again. With our focus on reading here, the necessity for wide reading and writing experience at the independent level becomes apparent (Johnston and Johnston, 1984, 1986).

A recent semester-long study involving over four hundred 5- to- 8- year-old-children examined one hundred communicative/language elements (Johnston and Johnston, in press). Forty pragmatic, 20 semantic relationships and 40 syntactic elements were tested using two different means of collecting data. We interviewed each child, talked to each principal and teacher and observed the classrooms, hallways and special areas. Our findings revealed a high level of competence with the communicative systems, a competence significant in two ways: 1) children at an early age can do a great deal with language, and 2) basal readers underestimate the language of children.

Our data reinforce the necessity of schools providing rich reading and writing programs which use the language of the children. We also found that those schools focusing on language competence had a greater effect on the affective domain. That is, children seemed to have a greater desire to communicate. From our research and that of others it seems clear that finding joy in language is a way toward improving literacy.

References

Anderson, R. C., et al. (1985). *Becoming a Nation of Readers*, Washington, D.C., National Institute of Education

Hillerich, R., (1983). *Principals' Guide to Improving Reading Instruction*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon

Johnston, E. B. & A. V. Johnston, (1984). *Piagetian Language Nursery*, Rockville, Md., Aspen Publishers

Johnston, A.V. & E. B. Johnston, (1986). The language of reading. *Ohio Reading Teacher*, XX:33

Laffey, J. L., (1980). The role of the elementary principal in the school reading program. *The Reading Teacher*, 33:632

Sanacore, J., (1988). Schoolwide independent reading: the principal can help. *Journal of Reading*, 31:346

READING TERMINOLOGY FOR THE UP-TO-DATE ADMINISTRATOR

SARAH L. DOWHOWER
Miami University

During the last two decades there has been a staggering increase in theoretical and instructional research in reading. Before 1980, the cumulative total of research articles published was a little over 1,000. Now over 1,000 are published annually (Dykstra, 1984). There are over 50 journals devoted entirely to elementary and secondary reading education. In addition, there are hundreds of newsletters, newspapers, and other journals that carry reading-related articles. As a result of this virtual explosion of information and research, more is known theoretically and

---

School administrators will be helped to communicate effectively through a dictionary of reading and literacy terms prepared by Sarah Dowhower. Another version appears in the January 1989 issue of *Principal.*

practically about learning to read than ever before.

The major thrust of reading research since the late 1970's has been in the area of comprehension. Researchers are trying to understand the reading process, and how readers comprehend written discourse. Teaching reading as thinking has become the new challenge even though it is an old theme. In addition, we have moved away from a "laundry list" of comprehension skills to the idea that there are numerous teaching and learning strategies to help students comprehend.

Research studies support the idea that if there is any necessary factor for an effective reading program, it is the presence of a strong leader--one who possesses knowledge of reading instruction and practices (See Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Hoffman & Rutherford, 1984; Lezotte, 1984; Samuels, 1981). To be an effective instructional leader, an administrator who keeps abreast of theories and practices in the reading field and is aware of the specialized vocabulary that has gained acceptance in the reading community over the last few years is necessary.

The reading terms presented here reflect the current thinking in the field. The list is organized into three categories: (1) general reading terms, (2) reading approaches, and (3) instructional reading strategies. (A reference list is presented in the appendix for those who would like to read more about specific terms and concepts.)

General Reading Terms

The Reading Process. "Reading is the process of constructing meaning from written text. It is a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information" (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985, p.7). Several kinds of knowledge seem to be related to reading success: knowledge of letter and sound correspondence, words and how they are strung together to convey thoughts, organization of texts, and general understanding of people, places, and things. Most scholars today agree that comprehension is an interaction between text and reader, that a reader elaborates and constructs meaning from the text, and that good readers read strategically, carefully monitoring their understanding.

Models of the Reading Process. There are three models of reading that are widely used to explain how children learn to read.

(1) Bottom-Up--readers progress in a linear fashion from identifying letters, to words, to clauses, to sentences and paragraphs. Readers are viewed as starting at the bottom and moving up. This model is called "data driven" and "text-based."

(2) Top-Down--reading begins with meaning. The process is initiated by making predictions or "educated guesses" about the meaning of a unit of print. Readers are viewed as starting from the top and moving down. This model is called "concept driven" and "reader-based."

(3) Interactive--translating print to meaning involves using all sources of knowledge, not necessarily in a linear fashion. At times the readers may use prediction and at other times phonic skills to gain meaning; or, decoding and hypotheses may happen simultaneously.

Schema Theory. A cognitive psychology term used to describe how humans organize and store information mentally. Schemata (plural) are an elaborate network of concepts, skills, expectations, and procedures used to make sense of the world. Readers add new information from the text to already existing schema or they dramatically alter a schema to accept new information. This theory helps us understand that meaning lies in the interaction between the text and the reader's prior knowledge and experience.

Metacognition. Referring to two different phenomena, this term is used to describe (1) the knowledge a person has about his or her own cognitive abilities and functioning and (2) the conscious effort to self-regulate. Metacognitive reading strategies involve thinking about what you know as you read, monitoring progress and comprehension, and using various techniques to improve comprehension when it has broken down. These corrective strategies include rereading, using context, reading ahead, reading aloud, referring to outside sources, and others.

Types of Comprehension. Teachers use various levels of comprehension and corresponding levels of questions to promote and assess understanding. Although there are numerous category systems and terms for types or levels of questioning, the most common are literal, interpretive, and applied.

(1) Literal--refers to explicitly stated ideas in the text.

(2) Interpretive--refers to reading between the lines with the idea that the author does not say all that is necessary for understanding and the readers must infer what the author is trying to say.

(3) Applied--refers to going beyond the text and creating new insights.

This involves analysis, synthesis, application, and evaluation or what is called creative and critical reading.

Direct Instruction. Direct comprehension in reading instruction means that the teacher either models the process of getting meaning or explicitly explains or describes what the student should do to comprehend. An example of the former is the strategy of Think Aloud (Baumann, Seifert-Kessell, & Jones, 1987; Bereiter & Bird, 1985); the latter, Inferential Training (Hansen, 1981).

Reading Approaches

Instructional approaches can be placed on a continuum from strong bottom-up to strong top-down emphasis. There are very few "pure" approaches.

Sub-skill. Those who follow this bottom-up approach believe that learning to read involves acquisition of a finite and large number of specific skills. Other terms to describe this approach are objective-based or criterion-referenced systems. Most basals are in part sub-skill oriented having a scope and sequence chart that delineates skills to be taught.

Holistic. Teachers here focus on helping children develop meaning. The units of instruction begin with sentences and whole text. Those who follow this top-down approach believe that reading is learned through activities involving listening, speaking, writing, and reading. Use of context and hypotheses are emphasized as opposed to sets of skills to be mastered. Psycholinguistic theories of Goodman (1967, 1976) and Smith (1982) have been the driving force of this approach and the popular movement.

Basal Reader. This approach is the most widely used in elementary schools today. Basal readers are a carefully graded series of books with controlled vocabulary and planned repetition of vocabulary. The most current series include the works of many well-known authors and illustrators. Most series try to address all phases of the reading program including word recognition, vocabulary development, comprehension, oral and silent reading, and reading for information and recreation. Teachers' manuals give an array of suggestions and detailed plans for each story and include a sequence of skills to be mastered. Reading educators recommend moving "from an overwhelming emphasis on basal readers and workbooks to a greater emphasis on comprehension strategies, a wider range of higher-quality reading materials, more independent reading for children, and more opportunities for combining reading and writing activities" (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1988, pp. 5-6).

Tradebook or Literature-Based. This approach uses library books (tradebooks) to teach reading. Those who advocate this approach believe that we should teach reading with real reading materials and that children should have more choice in what they read. Generally, tradebooks are used in three different ways: (1) an individualized approach in which each child reads independently, conferences with the teacher, and often does follow-up activities connected with each library book, (2) a small-group approach in which the children or teacher (or both) choose tradebooks and use them as the basis for instruction in small ability or interest groups called "book groups" (multiple copies of each text are required), and (3) recreational reading, which includes Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) and Drop Everything and Read (DEAR) programs.

Language Experience. This traditional approach was made popular in the last few decades by Stauffer (1969, 1980) and Allen (1973). Children dictate stories (often called experience charts) to the teacher and then the teacher uses this text as the material of instruction. The advantages of this approach are beginning to be appreciated in primary writing instruction (Dowhower & Munk, 1987) and upper grade reading/writing instruction (Heller, 1988).

Natural Reading. This holistic approach has evolved recently from descriptive research on how young children learn to read without formal reading instruction. Advocates feel that literacy develops on a continuum from birth to death, that reading, writing and oral language develop concurrently and are interrelated, and that children learn to read naturally as they are exposed to print-rich environments. Emergent literacy researchers are challenging three older reading tenets: (1) need for heavy skill-based instruction with young children, (2) existence of a prerequisite set of skills and abilities in order to learn to read--commonly called "reading readiness", and (3) belief that children must read before they write.

Reading-Writing Connection. This approach is closely tied to the natural reading and the whole language approach. Many proponents have adopted the stance that teachers should teach reading through writing and a generous exposure to good literature. Terms currently associated with this approach are (1) writing process--editing, revising, publishing, (2) invented spelling, (3) free writing, (4) journal writing--response logs, interactive journals, (5) prewriting strategies, and (6) writing/reading workshops.

Instructional Reading Strategies

Weinstein & Mayer (1986) list major categories of teaching-learning strategies to learn, remember, & think: (1) rehearsal strategies, (2) elaboration strategies, (3) organizational strategies, (4) comprehension monitoring strategies and (5) motivational strategies. Since Durkin's (1979) study in which she suggests that teachers were not teaching children strategies for comprehension, there have been numerous reading studies addressing instructional strategies in these categories. Following are six instructional strategies that help children improve comprehension and recall.

Advanced Organizers. This term refers to various strategies to help readers connect what they know with what they are about to read. There are several types: structural overview, written story preview, and oral presentation.

Structural Overviews. Also called visual displays, visual structures, or graphic organizers, this strategy helps readers organize, understand, and retain the major ideas in the text. Teacher or students arrange key points into a diagram or visual picture to show how the ideas are related. Overviews can be constructed before, during, or after reading and can be used with both narrative and expository text.

Semantic Mapping. A type of structural overview, this instructional strategy activates and builds on a student's prior knowledge. It is also called webbing, networking, and plot or concept maps. Semantic mapping is different from story mapping in that the purpose of the diagram is to show how words are related in categories and to develop concepts and vocabulary.

Active Comprehension or Self-Generated Questioning. This strategy is based on the rationale that if students ask questions (instead of the teacher) before, during, and after reading they will be actively monitoring their comprehension and learning will be enhanced. Reciprocal questioning is a variation of self-questioning developed by Palincsar and Brown (1984). Students are taught to ask questions, develop summary statements, find parts of the text that are confusing, and to make predictions.

Directed Reading-Thinking Activity. This is a strategy originally published by Stauffer (1969) involving children predicting what is going to happen and then validating those predictions as they read. The reader is actively involved in constructing meaning by setting purposes for reading and then finding evidence that supports or refutes the hypotheses.

Repeated Reading. This rehearsal strategy involves the rereading of meaningful texts until production is flowing and fluent. There are two different repeated reading procedures: (1) read-along or assisted in which a live or audio-taped model of the passage is used to practice, or (2) independent or unassisted in which no model is used.

Summary/Conclusion

If administrators are familiar with the various models of the reading process, have a working knowledge of reading approaches, and an understanding of the many recommended and researched teaching-learning strategies in reading, they can improve reading instruction in their schools. Many of these concepts are not new; many are old ideas cloaked in new terminology. There will be new terms tomorrow. This list is only a beginning to help those who wish to build an effective reading program.

References

Allen, R. V. (1973). The language experience approach. In R. Karlin (Ed.), *Perspectives on elementary reading: Principles and strategies of teaching.* NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Anderson, R.C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading.* Washington, D.C.: NIE.

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., & Mullis, I. V. S. (1988). *Who reads best: Factors related to reading achievement in grades 3, 7, and 11.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bereiter, C. & Bird, M. (1985). Use of think aloud in identification and teaching of reading comprehension strategies.

Baumann, J., Siefert-Kessell, N., & Jones, L. (1987). Effect of think aloud instruction in elementary students' ability to monitor comprehension. Paper presented at the 37th annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, St. Petersburg Beach, FL.

Dowhower, S. L., & Munk, J. (1987). Integrating language arts in the primary grades. In C. Personke & D. Johnson (Eds.), *Language arts instruction and* *the beginning teacher.* Englewood Cliffs; NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Durkin, D. (1978). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 14*, (4), 481-533.

Dykstra, R. (1984). Foreword. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research.* NY: Longman.

Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist, 6,* 126-135.

Goodman, K. S. (1976). Behind the eye: What happens in reading. In H. Singer & R. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and process in reading* (2nd Ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1985). Characteristics of highly effective elementary school reading programs. *Educational Leadership, 52* (5), 39-42.

Hansen, J. (1981). The effects of inference training and practice on young children's reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16* (3), 391-417.

Heller, M. F. (1988). Comprehending and composing through language experience. *The Reading Teacher, 42* (2), 30-35.

Hoffman, J. V. & Rutherford, W. L. (1984). Effective reading programs: A critical review of outlier studies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20* (1), 79-92.

Lezotte, L. (1984). Schools as a context for comprehension instruction. In C. Duffy, L. Rochler, & J. Mason (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction.* NY: Longman.

Palincsar, A. S. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1* (2), 117-175.

Samuels, S. J. (1981). Characteristics of exemplary reading programs. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews.* Newark, DE; IRA.

Smith, F. (1982). *Understanding reading* (3rd Ed.). NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stauffer, R. C. (1969). *Teaching reading as a thinking process.* NY: Harper & Row.

Stauffer, R. C. (1980). *Language experience approach to the teaching of reading*. NY: Harper & Row.

Weinstein, C. E. & Mayer, R. E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook on research on teaching* (3rd Edition). NY: Macmillan.

Appendix: Resources by Term

Reading Process:

Anderson, R. C. & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretical view of basic processes in reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.) *Handbook of reading research.* NY: Longman.

Duffy, G., Roehler, L., & Mason, J. (1984). The reality and potential of comprehension instruction. In G. Duffy, L. Roehler, & J. Mason (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction.* NY: Longman.

Models:

Vacca, J. L., Vacca, R. T., & Gove, M. (1987). *Reading and learning to read.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Schema Theory:

Anderson, R. C. & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretical view of basic processes in reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.) *Handbook of reading research.* NY: Longman.

Klein, M. LK. (1988). *Teaching reading comprehension and vocabulary: A guide to teachers.* Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mason, J. M. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of the reading process as a basis for comprehension instruction. In G. Duffy, L. Roehler, & J. Mason (Eds.), *Comprehension instructions.* NY: Longman.

Metacognition:

Baker, L. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research.* NY: Longman.

Types of Comprehension:

Burns, P., Roe, B., & Ross, E. (1988). *Teaching reading in today's elementary schools* (4th edition). Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin, pp. 230-269.

Direct Instruction:

Bereiter, C. & Bird, M. (1985). Use of think aloud in identification and teaching of reading comprehension strategies.

Cognition and Instruction, 2 (2), 131-156.

Cooper, J. D. (1986). *Improving reading comprehension.* Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin.

Pearson, P. D. (1985). Changing the face of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 38* (8), 724-738.

Three Instructional Approaches:

Vacca, J. L., Vacca, R. T., & Gove, M. (1987). *Reading and learning to read.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Basal Readers:

Burns, P., Roe, B., & Ross, E. (1988). *Teaching reading in today's elementary schools* (4th edition). Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin, pp. 230-269.

Vacca, J. L., Vacca, R. T., & Gove, M. (1987). *Reading and learning to read.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Tradebook or Literature-Based:

Cullinan, B. E. (1987). *Children's literature in the reading program.* Newark, DE: IRA.

Lehman, B. A. & Crook, P. R. (1988). Effective schools research and excellence in reading: A rationale for children's literature in the curriculum. *Childhood Education, 64* (4), 235-242.

Sloup, M. (1987). Teaching reading with tradebooks. In C. Personke & D. Johnson (Eds.), *Language arts instruction and the beginning teacher.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Language Experience:

Hall, M. (1978). *The language experience approach for teaching reading.* Newark, DE: IRA

Natural Reading:

Harste, J. C., & Burke, C. L. (1980). Examining instructional assumptions: The child as informant. *Theory into Practice, 19* (3), 170-178.

Holdaway, D. (1979). *Foundations of literacy.* Sydney, Australia: Ashton Scholastic.

Holdaway, D. (1984). *Stability and change in literacy learning.* Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Kline, L. W. (1988). Reading: Whole language development, renewed focus on literature spurs change. *ASCD Curriculum Update*, June 1988, 1-3.

Teale, W. H. (1978). Positive environments for learning to read: What studies of early readers tell us. *Language Arts, 55* (8), 922-932.

Teale, W. H. (1982). Toward a theory of how children learn to read and write naturally. *Language Arts, 59* (6), 555-570.

Reading-Writing Connection:

Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Books.

Hansen, J. (1983). First-grade writers who pursue reading. In P. Stock (Ed.). *Forum revisited*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Tway, E. (1987). *Writing is reading: 26 ways to connect*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Advanced Organizers:

Cooper, J. D. (1986). *Improving reading comprehension*. Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin.

Tierney, R. J. & Cunningham, J. W. (1984). Research on teaching reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.)

Handbook of reading research. NY: Longman.

Vacca, J. L., Vacca, R. T., & Gove, M. (1987). *Reading and learning to read.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Structural Overviews:

Jones, B. F., Pierce, J., & Hunter, B. (1988/89). Teaching students to construct graphic representations. *Educational Leadership* . 46 (4), 20-25.

McGee, L. & Richgels, D. (1985). Teaching expository text structure to elementary students. *The Reading Teacher, 38* (8), 739-749.

Semantic Mapping:

Heimlich, J. E. & Pittelman, S. D. (1986). *Semantic mapping: Classroom applications.* Newark, DE: IRA.

Active Comprehension:

Cohen, R. (1983). Self-generated questions as an aid to reading comprehension, *The Reading Teacher, 36* (8), 770-775.

Singer, H. & Donlan, D. (1982). Active comprehension: Problem-solving schema with question generation for comprehension of complex short stories. *Reading Research Quarterly, 17* (2), 166-186.

Directed Reading-Thinking Activity:

Blachowicz, C. (1983). Showing teachers how to develop student's predictive reading. *The Reading Teacher, 36* (7), 680-684.

Repeated Reading:

Dowhower, S. L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22* (4), 389-406.

Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated reading. *The Reading Teacher, 32* (4), 403-408.

Authors

The following biographical sketches are in order of appearance in this volume.

Margaret Early is past president, National Council of Teachers of English as well as the National Conference on Research in English. She is chair, Department of Communication and Instruction, University of Florida.

Wayne Otto is a feature writer for the International Reading Association's *Journal of Reading* and author of many publications about reading and school administration. He is a Professor at the University of Wisconsin.

Kay Walla is principal of Houston Elementary School, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Jo Anne Vacca is chair, Department of Teacher Development and Curriculum Studies, Kent State University.

Richard T. Vacca is co-author of widely used textbooks and Professor of Reading and Director of the Reading and Writing Development Center, Kent State University.

Sister Mary Ann Corr whose doctorate is in reading education, is Superintendent of Schools, Catholic Diocese of Steubenville, Ohio.

Eileen Tway is past President, National Conference on Research in English, and Professor, Miami University.

Maureen Vanterpool is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Teacher Education, Miami University.

Alan M. Frager, who is on the Editorial Advisory Board of the Journal of Reading, is Associate Professor, Miami University.

Andrew V. Johnston is Associate Professor, Miami University.

Elizabeth B. Johnston is in the Communications Department, Miami University.

Sarah Dowhower is Assistant Professor, Miami University, and Co-Director, Leaders for Literacy Conference.

Allen Berger is Heckert Professor of Reading and Writing and Director, Heckert Center, Miami University.